

THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D. in English.

FEBRUARY.1924.

Submitted by,

Gusta.Surendra Chandra.

(Internal Student)

KING'S COLLEGE.

LONDON.

ProQuest Number: 11015641

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 11015641

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

SHAKESPEARE IN INDIA.

(A general survey of Shakespeare's vogue in India, being an attempt to analyse the main causes of Shakespearean appreciation in India from the study of the Sanskrit drama together with a critical study of Shakespearean translations and adaptations in some of the principal Sanskritic vernaculars and a special treatment of such literature in Bengal.)

By

S.C.Gupta, M.A.



King's College,

London.

" How many ages hence
Shall this our lofty scene be acted o'er,
In states unborn and accents yet unknown!"

Julius Caesar, Act 3, Sc. 1.

PREFACE.

It seems necessary to point out at the very outset that the subject of this paper which is "Shakespeare in India" is a vast one, considering that Shakespeare in one form or another exists in as many as ten different Indian languages. For an exhaustive treatment of the subject, it requires a knowledge of this large number of Indian languages and as such it is frankly beyond the competence of any one scholar within the time spent by the writer over it. No such exhaustiveness is therefore claimed for the present attempt.

Yet, the main features of Shakespeare's Indian vogue studied from three or four Sanskritic languages, it is claimed, have been sufficiently well caught and interpreted. It is also maintained that the conclusion so reached can only be corroborated by the reading of Shakesperian versions in the rest of the Indian languages, they can never be vitiated or upset. There is only one old dramatic tradition in India and Indian customs and manners are almost the same all over the Peninsula. The conflict that has thus arisen cannot be expected to vary in any essential respect.

It may be indicated that the survey will be completed when special accounts on the line of the one in the last chapter of the different Shakesperian literatures in India have been written. This the writer hopes to do himself or in collaboration with other Indian scholars in a few years and then an exhaustive account of Shakespeare's vogue in India will have been accomplished. The ground-work and an important part of superstructure, it is hoped, have been built here.

It may not be out of place here to say that Sir Israel Gollance to whose inspiration the work is due and under whose

supervision the work has been carried out has evinced a lively interest in it in connection with his projected "Survey of Shakespeare" to which contributions have already commenced to be made. A paper arising out of the present dissertation entitled "Some aspects of the influence of Shakespeare in India" was read some time ago before the Shakespeare Association and was well received.

A few words regarding the extent of originality shown in the paper are needed. The subject, so far as the present writer knows, is handled here for the first time and the features of Shakespeare's Indian vogue which are described here are entirely the writer's own discovery and the interpretation given of them is entirely his own conclusion. The attempt made here is entirely a new one.

It remains now to express the writer's deep sense of gratitude to all who have helped him in various ways in the undertaking. First and foremost, the whole work owes its birth to inspiration received from Sir Israel Gollancz who has also unsparingly guided the writer's efforts. Messrs. A. Nicoll & A.W. Reed of the English staff of King's College have laid the writer under a heavy debt of obligation by constant encouragement and valuable advice and assistance. The writer feels no less obligation to Dr. Barnett, the Keeper of the Oriental Section of the British Museum, and Dr. Thomas of the India Office Library, for uniform courtesy and often valuable help.

C O N T E N T S.

Part. I.

MENTAL BACKGROUND.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE.

Introductory : Shakespeare's vogue in India - its nature, extent and significance. Its basis - the classical Sanskrit drama.

1-9

CHAPTER II.

Antiquity of the classical Sanskrit drama : its origin and subsequent development into the classical form.

10-17

CHAPTER III.

The Characteristics of the Classical Sanskrit plays. Their arrangement and principle which belie the theory of their Greek origin. Common features of them and the plays of Shakespeare.

18-47

CHAPTER IV.

Hindu Works on dramaturgy and poetics. Their contents and canons in their bearing on India's mental fitness for the study of the European drama.

48-97

Part. II.

Fruits of Shakesperian Studies.

CHAPTER I.

The Nature and fruits of Shakesperian studies and appreciation in India : Adaptations and translations in the several languages considered in their chronological and other aspects.

98-182

CHAPTER II.

Interplay between the Shakesperian dramatic model and the ancient classic model of India. The ultimate triumph of Shakespeare and his influence on the growth of the modern dramatic literatures in India. The modern Indian stage and its indebtedness to Shakespeare.

183-228

CHAPTER III.

Shakespeare in Bengali literature.

229-308.

A word about Transliteration &c.

The system of Transliteration followed in this work is that advocated by the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society, Great Britain and Ireland. This has been strictly observed in the Sanskrit passages; but in the case of proper names which have also been transliterated, it has not been possible to maintain the same strictness. Most proper names have a popular way of being written in English and disregard of this for the sake of purity and uniformity will merely make them look strange and nearly unfamiliar.

The writer would like to add a few words of apology for the very unsatisfactory typing of the thesis and would crave indulgence at the hands of the examiners. The difficulties which he has encountered in this regard will be realised when it is known that the work had to be carried out in a small Mofussil station over 400 miles away from Calcutta. Literary type-writing is unknown in such a place and he had to employ for a part of the work a typist almost ignorant of English. Even a good machine was not available for some time. In the midst of his busy occupations it was not found possible for the writer to type the entire work himself.

It is, however, hoped that after all the troubles that have been taken to correct all the mistakes and impart some neatness, discomfort in reading has been, to some extent, lessened and that it is in a fit condition to go to the press.

PART I.

MENTAL BACKGROUND.

Chapter I.

Introductory.

Shakespeare's vogue in India: its nature, extent and significance. Its basis—the classical Sanskrit drama.

In his excellent biography of Shakespeare, the eminent Shakesperian scholar Sir Sidney Lee, in the course of an account of Shakespeare's foreign vogue, thus refers to India:—

"A few (of Shakespeare's plays) have been rendered into Bengali, Hindustani, Marathi, Hindi, Tamil, Gujarati, Urdu, Kanarese and other languages of India, and have been acted in native Theatres."

The above notice forms the barest historical account of Shakespeare's Indian vogue and the eminent biographer of Shakespeare aimed at nothing more. But behind this simple bare statement of a historical fact, there lies such a world of interesting and fascinating happenings that a mere statement as the above fails to do any justice to the subject which is so vast and varied in its nature that only a separate treatment of it can bring out in all its completeness the significance that underlies this historical phenomenon. It is a consideration like this that prompts us to make a study in the following pages of this particular phase of Shakespeare's vogue, and it is hoped that the facts that will be brought out by this attempt will not only prove new but will also go a long way to strengthen Shakespeare's claim as the world's greatest dramatist.

The first significant feature about Shakespeare's

Indian vogue that forces itself on the attention of the investigator is that in this respect India should not be mixed up with other foreign countries. Generally, the measure of such a vogue is the number of translations and adaptations undergone by Shakespeare's plays in the language of a particular foreign country, and also the frequency of the production of these translated plays on the stage of that foreign country. Both these standards of valuation will apply to India also, but in a limited way. They can not form the whole measure as far as India is concerned. In the case of a foreign country, it is generally assumed that Shakespeare in the original is little known and that all knowledge of his immortal plays is derived from translations and adaptations if they happen to exist. The assumption is irreproachable as far as all other foreign countries go, but India alone among them forms an exception in this regard. India alone presents the unique spectacle among all foreign countries of possessing the widest first hand knowledge of Shakespeare's works, which is only next to that of the English speaking world. It will not do to measure the extent of Shakespeare's Indian vogue merely by the number of translations and adaptations that Shakespeare has undergone in the Indian languages--such a measure will always be partial and misleading. The fact of India's direct acquaintance with his works must be carefully taken into consideration and it must also be remembered that this first hand knowledge is increasing as the years roll by.

The cause of this unique phenomenon which India presents is not far to seek and will be discovered in the political link that binds her to England, Shakespeare's native country. The educational system that prevails in India, on account of this political connection, accords a very high place, if not the highest, to the teaching of English language and literature, which spreads from the school stage upwards. It is no wonder, then, that where the knowledge of English literature is almost obligatory the masters of this literature will be well known and the greatest of them most widely known.

While the history of India's political connection with England explains the real extent of Shakespeare's Indian vogue and extends its boundary considerably beyond what the few translations and adaptations of his plays would seem to imply, it, at the same time, places it under a ~~real~~ suspicion which hardly attaches to it in other foreign countries free from Britain's political domination. An extremely evil odour of its being a forced growth clings to it and thus spoils the effect of its being the largest among all foreign countries. Those who view the subject from outside only are apt to be misled to the extent of thinking that it rests on no recognition of Shakespeare's superior merits as a dramatist. They may very well argue in the following vein:—"If Fate had willed it otherwise and the custody of India's political destinies had passed into French hands for which the French were contending at the same time that the English did, having instead of Shakespeare would have established and enjoyed a similar vogue in India. So Shakespeare's Indian

vogue redounds very little to his glory."On the face of it, the argument seems unanswerable but it will hardly bear a strict examination in the light of the true facts.

There is no gainsaying the fact that Shakespeare has entered India in the wake of political annexation and his vogue, at its inception, was due to the political supremacy obtained by Britain in India. But the extent of his indebtedness in this respect to this political event does not seem to be beyond what may be termed an introduction to India. His subsequent conquest of the mind of India has been made by himself, and the honours of this belong to him and him alone. For, as the following pages will reveal, the annexation of intellectual India to his wide domain was not effected without a struggle and conflict of a purely literary character.

The stigma that attaches to Shakespeare's Indian vogue on account of Britain's political domination in India disperses itself as soon as we proceed to inquire into the real basis on which India's appreciation of his masterpieces rests. In the European countries other than his own or including even his own, the tradition of a classical drama inherited from the ancient Greeks had long existed before the advent of Shakespeare. This tradition more or less colours all European judgment of his works and wherever he has established a vogue it has been done in the face of this tradition from which he differs in so many ways. In other countries, where no such dramatic tradition of any kind exists, his vogue is in the nature of a ~~surprise~~ literary surprise and the homage paid to him is the respect accorded to one who

who introduces a novelty. To none of the above categories does India belong. India was not without past literary achievements at the time Shakespeare was introduced there and she was not taken by storm by a new literary phenomenon. India's literary attainments were considerable, many-sided, and as high as those of any ancient nations. Especially in that particular form of literature viz. dramatic literature she was as richly endowed as any ancient country ever was. The tradition of a great drama--the classical Sanskrit Drama--existed there and it was as dominant as the classical tradition of the Greek drama that Shakespeare had to face and overthrow in Europe before he could obtain recognition as the unrivalled master of his craft.

Thus it has not been possible for Shakespeare to pass muster in India without a challenge and a scrutiny. He ~~could~~ could not be imposed on intellectual India in the nature of a political decree by the dominating political power and prestige of his country. Superficially his ascendancy in India may look like a political event but those who are conversant with the facts know that appearances are wholly deceptive in this case. Those who have any acquaintance with the classical dramatic literature of India know that any uncritical reception of Shakespeare there is impossible. From the very day Shakespeare set foot in India he was confronted by a rival no less formidable than the one he met and overthrew in Europe--a rival of independent origin having nothing to do with his former adversary.

It is with this mental background supplied by the ancient classical drama that India has from the very outset

approached the study of Shakespeare's dramas. The very high appreciation that he has met with in India is based on a carefully balanced judgment of the two models that his dramas and the classical dramas present. The modern Indian drama that imitates the Shakesperian model in preference to the ancient model of the land leaves no room for doubt as regards the nature of the appreciation extended to Shakespeare. But this recognition of his superior merits and the final choice of his type have not taken place without a conscious struggle. Some of the translations and adaptations of Shakesperian dramas in the Indian languages bear unequivocal traces of this conflict into which Shakespeare was thrown in India.

The study of Shakespeare's Indian vogue, therefore, involves as a matter of necessity a careful study of this mental equipment which India has brought to bear upon her Shakesperian studies and which forms the very foundation of her critical appreciation and considered acceptance of the Shakesperian model. This process of comparative judgment to which Shakespeare has been subjected also involves in its initial stages, a conflict between the two rival types, a study of which is also essential to a proper understanding of the real significance of Shakespeare's Indian vogue. This conflict, as will be seen in the following pages, has been of a very mild nature without any of that savageness of attack in which the corresponding conflict in Europe culminated in the now notorious diatribes of Voltaire, the most outstanding champion in literary history of a

forlorn cause. None the less, the conflict was a real one and if it has been free from any condemnation of Shakespeare and consequent acrimonious attack on him as an erratic literary genius, it has been only due to the fact that there are astonishing points of resemblance between his type of dramas and the ancient type which he encountered in India. Yet, there are countless differences created by those artificial rules and conventions that hedge the composition of the classical product of India, and these differences made the clash a real one. The story of this clash of models is a very interesting one, no less interesting than the one that took place in Europe and its outcome is the same as the outcome of the previous one. Shakespeare's dramatic genius has now proved itself unrivalled in the East as it did in the West. East or West, he is now the undisputed monarch in the realm of drama and the homage of the whole world he claims and wins in his own right divine.

The above are some of the enthralling features of Shakespeare's Indian vogue, which we attempt to study in the following pages; and it will be readily conceded that unless these are faithfully interpreted, any account of Shakesperian studies in India will be barren and empty. Any such interpretation requires a satisfactory acquaintance with the form of that classical Indian drama which Shakespeare had to encounter and combat for the establishment of his world supremacy. It is also necessary to show that the struggle he entered on in India was of a new type and entirely unconnected with the one in Europe from which he came out.

a victor. With this object an enquiry into the origin of the classical Indian drama has been undertaken in the following pages, and an endeavour has been made to ~~restate~~ restate as clearly and briefly as possible the conclusions arrived at by distinguished Orientalists with regard to the independent nature of the classical heritage of India so often and so erroneously supposed to be an imitation of the Greek drama. The gain for Shakespeare in this matter is obvious. Two independent rivals of great antiquity-- one in the East and the other in ~~in~~ the West--met him in conflict on his appearance and threatened to bar his progress. Both now lie humbled in the dust and his claim as the greatest dramatist in the world there is none to dispute.

The eastern conflict in which Shakespeare became involved in India reveals another interesting phase which we have tried to feature fully. It is a well known fact that the large humanity of Shakespeare's mind transcends all limitations of time and place and that the secret of his universal appeal lies in his myriad-mindedness. Still, "The West is West and the East is East" and though it is blasphemous to say that "the twain shall never meet" on broad grounds of common humanity, even the most elemental desires and longings of the common heart, the most primary passions and affections have their different ways of expressing themselves in these two portions of the globe. Thus there are divergent customs and manners obtaining in the East and the West, which are not mutually understood. Shakespeare dealing with Western men and women could not soar above

their customs and manners through which they necessarily express themselves. To superficial Eastern mind they prove a stumbling block in the way of sympathetic comprehension of Shakespeare's profound thoughts and ideas. Thus, in the Indian versions of Shakespeare, it has become necessary to adapt Shakespeare in this respect to Indian conditions and Indian modes of expressing thoughts and feelings. All these form a highly intriguing study and have an important place in any investigation into Shakespeare's Indian vogue. They show what additional difficulties he had to surmount in order to establish himself in the heart of India. In the European countries, except the opposition of a long established classical form, no such obstacles of an external nature impeded his way. It is no common addition to his glory that all impediments of these diverse forms have been successfully overcome by the irresistible power of his unique genius.

It is hoped that a fair indication of the real significance of Shakespeare's Indian vogue has been given above; also, that the lines on which an enquiry into this highly fascinating subject should proceed have been fairly laid down. The following pages represent an attempt to follow out these lines and thus to form an adequate estimate of Shakespeare's vogue in India.

CHAPTER II.

Antiquity of the classical Sanskrit drama. Its origin and subsequent development into the classical form.

In the introductory chapter we sought for the basis of Shakespeare's vogue in India and we concluded by discovering it in the classical Sanskrit drama, the study of which forms a sufficient mental background for the critical reception and appreciation in India of Shakespeare's masterpieces. Now this classical drama, originated, how ancient in time it is in its origin, what it is in form and content are topics which are proposed to be discussed in this and the following chapters. Such enquiries, it will be seen, are not wholly impertinent to the subject matter of our study. At least this can be safely claimed that they will form a very fascinating reading, if for nothing else, for the simple reason that with the perfected type of it as represented by the extant plays Shakespeare's dramas evince an astonishing affinity.

An enquiry into the origin and early stages of development of the classical Hindu drama, beyond establishing its very great antiquity, does not yield much definite result.

Its beginning is wrapped in impenetrable obscurity and though legends abound as to its birth, it is impossible to glean any historical fact from them. The legendary account found in the earliest extant critique on Hindu dramaturgy (Bharata Nāṭya Śāstra) that Brahma the creator created the dramatic art as a Veda or a revealed book and communicated it to Bharata, a divine sage, is historically valueless.

At most this myth can prove of some interest as constituting a comparative study in connection with a similar mythical account which attributes the invention of the dramatic art in Greece to a legendary personage called Thespis. Bharata is perhaps introduced into the legend owing to the fact that the authorship of the oldest Hindu treatise on the art of dramatic composition viz: Bharata-Nāṭya Śāstra is attributed to him. Bharata is also reputed to be the author of two dramas called "Triṅgura Dāna" and "Lakṣmī-Svayanvara", but no trace of these two dramas exists today.

We have to travel back over a considerable period of time, in fact a few centuries, to the Vedic days to discover the first glimmerings of a dramatic idea in ancient Hindu literature. These are to be found in the dialogues in the hymns of the Rig-Veda, which are fifteen in number. The date of the composition of the Vedas is placed by Orientalists in 1500 or 1300 B.C. by a majority with the exception of Jacobi who pushes it further back. As pointed out by Professor Macdonell, the dialogues between the following personages of the Vedic Pantheon, Saramā and the Panis, Yama and Yamī, Purūravas and the nymph Urvasī, contain unmistakably the germs of a future dramatic literature. Disentangled from the main body of the hymns they might well form the nucleus of a dramatic literature, or might even be regarded as diminutive plays. It is a very significant fact that long afterwards the greatest dramatist of India, Kālidāsa, took the story of King Purūravas and Nymph Urvasī from this

source and wrought and elaborated it into a magnificent drama. It is not possible to press our inquiry beyond the Vedic age for no record is available and it is believed that we can safely seek the dim beginning of the Hindu drama here and make this our starting point. Besides these dramatic dialogues in the Vedas, the performance of rituals according to Vedic prescriptions also had a distinct dramatic element in it. For instance, on the occasion of the sacrifice of a horse or on similar ritualistic occasions, the practice of the performers and priests of the Rig-Veda and the Yajur-Veda was to recount old histories and they used to declaim in turn. Sometimes there was a contest between an Āryya and a Sūdra for a prize not more valuable than a skin.

There is hardly any room for doubt that the Hindu drama, like the Greek drama, is religious in its origin. Its rude beginnings have been traced to the days of the composition of the Vedas. In Vedic dialogues, in Vedic rituals, combined very likely with religious dances, the Hindu drama arose. The perfected type of it viz: the extant classical Sanskrit drama, still retains traces of its growth in religion. We notice them in the Nandi or benediction which forms the introductory part of the play and which has to be uttered before the commencement of the play. The fact that these plays, though on secular themes, are all written to be performed at the Spring festival, a religious function, proves their original connection with religion. The popular forms of this ancient drama, that still exist in some parts of

India, are all associated with religion, especially the worship of the god Visnu or Krana. All the above facts leave no doubt in the mind that the Hindu drama was at its origin designed to form a part of Brahmin rituals.

The history of the subsequent development of the Hindu drama till it was evolved, perfected and stereotyped into the extant classical Sanskrit drama is one beset with great uncertainties and difficulties. The main outlines of these stages of development can merely be conjectured: nothing can be positively stated. There no doubt came a time when the drama was separated from religion in matter and theme and it assumed its secular character. No materials exist for the construction of a reliable account of this emancipation; the second stage we may call it in the process of its evolution, - to show the time when, and the manner in which this transformation was brought about. Of one single aspect of this evolutionary process, however, we are more than certain. It is that the Vedic religious plays performed on the occasions of heroic sacrifices gave rise, in due course, to a vast body of popular plays - perhaps partly secular and partly religious -- written in the vernacular varieties (i.e. Prākṛits) of the Sanskrit language. This inference is made on the very strong ground that the highly developed classical Sanskrit drama bears a considerably Prākṛit nomenclature. It is a very curious and significant fact that very few Sanskrit terms are used to signify acting, actors, different kinds of plays, theatrical appliances etc., and that most of these terms are borrowed from Prākṛit vocabulary for use

in the Sanskrit plays and treatises on dramatic composition. This curious phenomenon can be explained only in one way and it admits of only one explanation conclusion. This could only happen if there had been previously in existence a body of Prakrit plays sufficiently vast and important to give permanently its nomenclature to a production written in the language of the cultured. That such a body of Prakrit dramas existed and that through them primarily the secularisation of the Hindu drama was effected seems beyond doubt, but these plays are all lost without a single exception.

Assuming that the second stage in the evolution of the classical Hindu drama was brought about in the manner indicated above, and in the absence of fresh data the supposition is almost irresistible, we are next confronted with new difficulties in fixing the date at which the classical drama as it survives today came to take its form. This may be regarded as the third or final stage in the development of the Hindu drama for, in form and structure, it now became stereotyped and after a period of vigorous growth and success it began to decline. The extant plays are no reliable guide in the matter of determining the time when, as a special type, they first came into being: for they represent a period in which the classical drama flourished in full splendour, also that in which its decadence may be said to have set in. The antiquity of this classical type is, therefore, much greater than what the

existing plays would lead us to suppose. The most glorious age of the classical Hindu drama began with the establishment of the Gupta Empire in 320 A.D. (according to Vincent Smith) and it lasted till 600 A.D. The plays of this period are extant and they, in the absence of any plays written previous to this period, have misled many to place here the starting point of the classical Hindu drama. Recently a remarkable discovery has been made in Central Asia, which disproves this theory. This discovery relates to the unearthing of some fragments of Buddhist dramas which the consensus of Oriental scholarship assigns to the 1st Century B.C. or the early 2nd Century B.C. according as the time of the Kusāna King Kaniska might be held to have been. They belong to the early Kusāna period and one of the authors is Asvaghosa, the court-poet of Kaniska, whose accession to the throne, according to Vincent Smith, took place in c. 120 A.D. The most recent discovery, however, relates to the plays of Bhāsa, a dramatist who has long been known by tradition and who is mentioned very reverently by Kalidasa as a worthy predecessor in the dramatic art. Controversy is still raging round his identity and the time when he flourished. It is, however, very doubtful whether he will carry us back further than the fragments of the Buddhist dramas above alluded to, or even as far back as that.

Proof of a different nature, other than what would be supplied by the actual existence of plays, is available to date the beginning of the classical Sanskrit drama as far back as 350 B.C. Pāṇini, the renowned grammarian, who

according to some authorities (Of Gold Stucker's Panini, in which the subject is discussed at some length) flourished in c 350 B.C., lays down rules in his grammar for the formation of the names of the followers of Śilālin and Kṛśāśvin, writers of two text books for actors (Nāṭya Sūtra). Though these two text books are not in existence, yet this testimony as to the existence of Sanskrit plays about 350 B.C. is indisputable. Long afterwards, but very long before the time of Kālidāsa and other dramatists, Pāṇini's commentator Patanjali (c140 B.C.) mentions in his Mahabhasya actors and two specific plays--Kamsavadha and Balibandhana by name--both celebrating the deeds of god Vāṇu. These plays, it is needless to say, are all lost but this allusion to them shows the continuity of the production of classical Sanskrit plays which might be taken as having been finally evolved at least in 350 B.C.

In the light of the above facts, however meagre they might be, we are perhaps justified in holding that the classical Sanskrit drama, as it exists today, is the final stage in the evolution of the Hindu drama which is found in an embryonic state in the Vedic dialogues, which undoubtedly passed through its second stage in the shape of popular Prakrit plays and which reached its present form at least about 350 B.C. In this present form the classical Hindu drama became stereotyped between 350 B.C. and the first century B.C. or the early second century B.C.

The relevancy to the real subject matter of our enquiry of this somewhat detailed investigation--as far as

facts would allow--into the origin and development of the classical Hindu drama may well be questioned. We apprehended this fully at the outset of this chapter and pleaded in extenuation the interest that would undoubtedly be created by the great antiquity of this particular type of drama on which Shakesperian criticism and appreciation in India was based. We are aware that such a reason will be considered far from satisfying; but we are at the same time confident that this inquiry has a material bearing on the subject matter of our study. It is necessary for us, for reasons fully stated in the introductory part of the next chapter, to establish the independent origin and growth of the Hindu drama. We have to combat the theory that the Hindu drama has a Greek origin and this can not be successfully done except by studying the structure and principles of that drama, which forms the subject of the succeeding chapter. This inquiry into its origin and the history of its subsequent development is purported to be, in its way, a supplement to our discussion in that chapter.

CHAPTER III.

The characteristics of the classical Sanskrit plays. Their arrangement and principle which belie the theory of their Greek origin. Common features of these plays and the plays of Shakespeare.

In the preceding chapter an endeavour has been made to discover the date when the Hindu drama first originated, to follow the course of its gradual evolution and to fix the time when the extent classical drama may be held to have been finally evolved. As we have seen, the crude beginnings of this drama may be traced back to 1800 or 1500 B.C., the time of the Vedas and the final development of these first elements into the finished classical product may be safely dated as between 350 B.C. and the first century or second century A.C. This study of the origin of the Hindu drama and the stages of its subsequent development is important to our special inquiry in a very material way. The greatness of Shakespeare's dramatic genius will appear to gain enormously when the independent nature of the test applied to him in the East is established on unassailable grounds. Shakespeare, according to our best judgment, has been subjected to two very rigorous independent tests, one in the West and another in the East. About the first there is scarcely any difference of opinion. His works have been weighed in the balance with the ancient model supplied by the classical Greek drama--a highly finished product of great antiquity and have been first pronounced as wanting, and then accepted ultimately as far transcending all the dramatic efforts of the ancients. A like process of assessment of his merits as a dramatist has taken place in India with the very significant exception that at no time has any spirit of hostility and disparagement been

evident towards his productions. No sentence of condemnation has ever been passed on his works, and his place as the supreme dramatic genius of the world has been accorded him readily enough, but not without careful and conscious judgement. This has been due to the fact that Shakespeare has been at once found to approximate very closely and in some essential respects to an ancient type of drama existing there. It has also been discovered that he surpasses this type in many other respects and the characteristic catholicity of the Hindu mind in matters pertaining to the spirit has not failed to pay homage where homage is due. As will become evident from what follows, there is no sharp antithesis in structural conception, principles of arrangement, manipulation of characters and incidents, between the classical Hindu drama and Shakespeare's dramas. This has, no doubt, smoothed in a very high degree the way to his proper appreciation in India.

But this comparison between Shakespeare's dramas and the ancient drama of India, and the verdict ungrudgingly given in favour of his undoubted supremacy, themselves would not much redound to his credit unless it can be proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that this ancient drama is a highly developed product of independent growth and character and is of equal antiquity, if not of greater, and of equal merit with the ancient drama of Europe. To this end we have pursued our enquiry into the origin of this drama and have constructed our theory of its contin of its continuity from its inception in the Vedic ages to the time when it assumed its present classical shape and rigidity. As far as this enquiry and theory are concerned, nothing more

then their reasonableness is claimed because we are handicapped in making a larger claim from the lack of corroborative materials viz: the plays written during this period. But our view with regard to the independence of the Hindu drama of all foreign influences will be substantially confirmed by the study which we now propose to make of its characteristic features and principles.

Before we launch into the highly interesting study of the characteristics of the classical Hindu drama which, as we have maintained, supplies the necessary mental outfit for a critical judgment of Shakespeare's works, it is necessary for us to allude to and dispose of a persistent theory that denies to the Indian drama the status of an independent creation and makes it a child of the Greek drama. It is well to go into the history of this startling theory and discover what sanction it has behind it of great names in the field of oriental research. The suggestion was first made by Prof. Weber in his well-known and widely read "History of Indian Literature". He was followed by the Danish Orientalist E. Brandes who took up the idea and carried it much further in his "Indian Studies". Brandes tried to show that the Indian drama was derived from the New Attic Comedy of the School of Menander, now mainly extant in the Roman adaptations of Plautus and Terence. It remained for Dr. Windisch to elaborate the theory and put it on a firm basis in a highly interesting contribution to the Congress of Orientalists held in Berlin in 1882 (Transactions of the Oriental Congress in Berlin 1882. Der Griechische Einfluss in Indischen

Drama) I. He supports his contention by referring to the historical fact of the establishment of commercial intercourse between Alexandria and Ozena or Ujjain, the seat of Kalidasa's activities. He also traces resemblance between the structure and the plots of the Indian drama and those of the Greco-Roman Comedy. Ever since the sturdy champions of Hellenic culture and civilisation have never tired of ringing changes on it. It is not surprising to see scholars who are not Orientalists, but who have an excess of Hellenic enthusiasm, woefully betray themselves into categorical assertions on the subject. For instance, Mr. A. E. Haig in his "Early History of Greek Tragedy" thus delivers himself:—"It is from the Greeks that every drama, both ancient and modern which has attained to anything like perfection of form, is ultimately derived... The Hindu dramas have far less claim to rank as indigenous creations. None of them belong to an earlier date than the first century before Christ. But long before that date period the Hindus had been brought into contact with the influence of Greek civilisation by means of the Hellenic dynasties established in the North-Western districts of India. The effect of that contact may still be found in the style of their early ~~set~~ structure; and it is not improbable that the expansion of their drama was due to the same original cause. It has been pointed out by recent scholars that the most ancient of the Indian plays contain various

I. Mr. J. K. Belvalker writing in the Calcutta Review, May, 1882, on the origin of the Indian drama, quotes Windisch as modifying his opinion in his History of Sanskrit Philology, Part II. In this work he says that he does not hold that the origin of the Indian drama is exclusively due to Greek influence. He merely means that it received important suggestions from Greek sources (The New Attic Comedy) in course of its development.

features which are not strictly oriental, but recall the characteristics of the Greek Theatre." Even such an acute critic and historian as Mr. V. A. Smith falls a victim to the blandishments of this seductive theory. He does not lay much store by the resemblances traced between the Indian drama and the Greco-Roman Comedy for he says in effect that he is convinced of the Greek origin of the Hindu drama, though the identity is very artfully disguised by the Hindu imitators. But the main volume of Oriental scholarship, we find, is solidly arrayed against such a theory. Prof. H. H. Wilson, Prof. A. A. Macdonell, Sylvain Levi whose "Le Theatre Indien" is universally regarded as the most authoritative treatise on the subject, Sten Konow, Prof. E. J. Rapson have all rejected it as extremely unsound and unconvincing. Mr. E. P. Herrwitz in "The Indian Theatre" sums up the position of this opposing camp in the following words:-

"Ever since the days of Alexander the Great, Greek colonies were thriving at the seaports and trading stations of the East... Ujjain and Kanauj, where the early Sanskrit Theatre took root and flourished, may have come in contact with Greek trade and culture, nay, Kalidasa and Bana had perhaps some acquaintance with Attic wit and letters. Even if all these assumptions were

I. "The East has seldom shown much readiness to learn from the West, and when Indians have condescended, as in the case of relief sculpture and the drama, to borrow ideas from European teachers, the thing borrowed has been so cleverly disguised in native trappings that the originality of the Indian imitators is stoutly maintained even by acute and learned critics." - V. A. Smith, "The Early History of India."

were correct, although there is no basis for them, still the classical Theatre of the Hindus would have a just claim to ~~the~~ originality... On the contrary, there are weighty reasons for disbelieving in such influences. The Greek and Hindu plays diametrically differ both in arrangement and principle. The Greeks recognized the unity of time and place (unknown to the Hindus) Indian Drama). The Greek chorus, in the character of a moral Judge, is entirely unknown in Indian productions. On the other hand, the happy blending of tragic and comic incidents is altogether against the rules of the Athenian stage. The keynote of Greek poetry is joy and pride of life, but Sanskrit dramas, though they all end well, generally moralise on the text that life is but vanity and vexation of spirit."

The plausibility of the doctrine of the Greek origin of the Hindu classical drama, as becomes clear from a study of the literature on the subject, is mainly derived from the unfortunate fact that no Sanskrit play composed prior to the first century B.C. survives today. Long before that date a slight contact between India and Greece had been established through Alexander's invasion in 357 B.C. The main body of the extant Sanskrit plays also date from a period when that contact with the West had been further advanced and made more intimate. The advocates of this theory concentrate all their attention on this period and do not take any notice--as they think they are justified in doing so in the absence of any existing plays of earlier periods--of the dramatic dialogues in the Vedas, of the undoubted existence of a dramatic literature in the popular literary dialects, of a subsequent growth of Sanskrit plays long before Alexander's invasion as indicated

by the mention of two such plays made by Panini's commentator. They would make the extant classical Sanskrit drama an exotic growth borrowed from the Greeks and unrelated to India's past and unrooted in the Indian soil.

This extreme plausibility lent to the theory by historical events, however, breaks down as soon as we begin to compare these two types of dramas. In spirit and principle they are as the poles asunder. Minor resemblances there are bound to be, but divergences in essential points are what outweighs any such accidental likenesses. These differences in essentials are so conspicuous and glaring that Mr. V. A. Smith, in his eagerness to explain them away, would put them down to the extreme cleverness of the imitators anxious to cover the track of their borrowings and blind "acute and learned critics" to the fact of their indebtedness to a foreign source!

This allusion to the theory of the Greek origin of the Indian drama, an impartial statement of the grounds on which it is built, an account of the authority that lies behind it, an examination of its merits, a reference to its rejection by most Oriental scholars--all these are made with the object of establishing an independent basis for the classical Hindu drama which, as we have previously stated, has formed the test of Shakespeare's dramatic power in the East and which, after a very careful consideration of the theory, we find to be a new and independent test. It is not by a by-product of the ancient Greek drama that Shakespeare has been judged in India. It is not the Western measure appearing in India in an oriental

garb and being reapplied. The fact that he has not only stood it well but has been found immeasurable by it in many respects makes a large addition to his greatness and proves once again that as a dramatic poet he alone is his own measure in the whole world and all ancient standards are outdistanced by him.

Now we enter on the proposed study of the form and the general features of the Hindu drama that is extant. Over and above the facts that common lineaments will be discovered in abundance between this type and Shakesperian drama, which are the bedrock of the eulogistic appreciation accorded him in India, the conspicuous differences it exhibits from the Greek drama will also be brought into strong relief and made undeniably palpable. This study will also serve a third and very important purpose. When we shall take up the study of the vernacular adaptations and translations of Shakespeare's plays in India, we shall meet with, in the first tentative efforts, some features not to be found in Shakespeare, something which is evidently added out of deference to a pre-existing model, something which is only explicable by a knowledge of that model.

The arrangement of a Sanskrit play is of the following nature. It always begins with a benediction or prayer (In Sanskrit called Nāndī) addressed to some deity, and this is pronounced by the Sūtradhāra or Manager. This practice has been already referred to in the discussion of the religious origin of the Hindu drama. After the Nāndī follows the prologue (in Sanskrit Āmukha or Prastāvana) in which the Manager holds a dialogue with some actor with the express purpose of acquainting

the audience with the author of the piece, his other known works, the actors, and as much of the antecedent events as are necessary to be known for the comprehension of the play. This prologue or induction which is in the form of a dialogue is very much like the prologue used by Beaumont and Fletcher, Marston, Heywood. Goethe's "Faust" furnishes a parallel in comparatively recent days. Shakespeare also has in some plays its prologues and epilogues though not exactly of the same type.

The opening prayer and the dialogue are both essential features of the classical Indian drama. But while the prayer has no organic relation to the play, the prologue forms a vital part of it. It is designed to set the play in motion which it accomplishes by skilfully leading up to the opening scene. After the prologue, the regular action of the play begins and is systematically carried on by means of regular divisions into acts and scenes. This division of Hindu plays into acts is a matter of great significance for it strikes a severe blow at the theory of their Greek origin. This device is not to be found in Greek plays. On this point Prof. H. H. Wilson makes the following pertinent remarks in his "Select Specimens of Hindu Theatre":- "The precise division of Hindu plays into acts is a feature which serves to discriminate them from the Greek compositions, in which the division into acts was unknown, the only distinction recognised being those of Prologue, Episode and Exode, regulated by intervening songs of the Chorus, to which we find nothing parallel in the regular plays of the Hindus. The division into acts appears to have been an arrangement

invented by the Romans, from whom we can hardly suspect the Hindus to have derived it".

The management of scenes and acts is very much like that observed on the classical and the French stage. The exit of one character and the entrance of another mark one scene from another and the stage is never left empty during the act which comes to an end only with the disappearance of all the characters from the stage. Interludes (called *Vishkambhaka* or *Pravesaka* in Sanskrit) in the shape of monologues or dialogues are often interposed between acts with the object of making known to the audience the events that have occurred since the preceding act. It will be interesting to note in this connection that though this device is absent from Elizabethan dramas, an instance in Shakespeare which might be construed as such is really taken for one and is termed *Vishkambhaka*. This is done in a Marathi adaptation of the Winter's Tale named *Sangit Samasya Sambhrama Nataka* (1895) by Gajanan Chintaman Dora. The fourth act of the original play begins with the appearance of Time, the Chorus, who begs leave "to slide over sixteen years" and recounts as much of the incidents of these years as are necessary for the comprehension of what follows. In the adaptation Time is dispensed with and Gopal (The Shepherd, Perdita's foster-father) appears to announce the lapse of time and to relate the fate of Malati (Perdita) during the period. This interlude is formally termed *Vishkambhaka* in the adaptation. The acts in a Sanskrit play range from five to ten and the business of the story is strictly kept within the limits and is so

skillfully manipulated that the final development is always achieved in the last act. The play is concluded with a closing prayer which like the opening prayer bears no organic connection with the play itself.

The above, in brief, forms an adequate description, as far as we are concerned, of the arrangement and structure of the Hindu drama. It will be noticed that, as far as structural conception and formation go, it is not in the least indebted to the Greek play. In fact, it offers few or no points of similarity and in respect of an essential feature viz: the device of acts and scenes, it presents a glaring contrast and perhaps it may be claimed, a decided advance. But nowhere is this contrast between these two types of dramas more marked than in the matter of the unities of time and place which form a distinctive badge of the classical drama of Europe. The Greeks recognised these unities and the Hindu dramatists show an almost total neglect of such rules. It is a very curious fact that this important aspect of Hindu plays should be ignored by the advocates of the theory of the Hellenic origin of the Hindu drama.

The unity of action, however, is rigidly insisted on and observed in the Sanskrit drama and it may be said that without it no drama as an artistic production can have any claim to its name, and any type of drama sufficiently developed as an art will be found to recognise it without laying itself open to the charge

of plagiarism from a foreign source. But even here a distinction will be noticed between the Hindu drama and the Greek drama. That extreme simplicity of business which is a strict requirement of the Greek type is rarely discoverable in the Hindu type and episodic incidents and stories are often woven into the main plot with rare dexterity and consummate dramatic skill.

Extreme simplicity and bareness of incidents and situations may hardly be regarded as the requirements of dramatic art. As an artist, the dramatist is required to keep steadily in view one supreme necessity and it is that the structure he creates is an organic whole, with inevitable and harmonious connexions and relations of parts. We must be at pains that the whole he builds up with many inter-related and inter-dependent parts does not reduce itself to a merely mechanical, arbitrary and haphazard joining of one part to another. As long as this is scrupulously avoided, as long as his work gives the sense of a perfected organism, so long his art does not suffer, nor does he sin against the rule of the ~~the~~ unity of action by multiplying incidents and situations. On the contrary, it argues ~~the~~ greater skill and dexterity on his part in his art. It is in this greater sense that the unity of action is understood and pursued by Hindu Play-wrights as well as by the greatest dramatic genius of the world, Shakespeare.

It is not to be supposed that Hindu Dramatists did not understand this rule of the unity of action in all its purity and simplicity. In one instance viz : in the play called "Mudrārākṣase" it is observed with such strictness that Prof. Wilson finds it hard to withhold his admiration. Thus he writes :- "The plot of the drama singularly conforms to one of the unities, and the occurrences are all subservient to one action, the conciliation of Rākṣase. This is never to be lost sight of from first to last, without being made unduly prominent. It may be difficult in the whole range of dramatic literature to find a more successful illustration of this rule."

Be that as it may, the rule of the unity of action is never observed in the Hindu drama to the exclusion of episodic performances. In this respect parallels will readily suggest themselves to one's mind in the Shakespearean and other English Plays. These common features contribute in no small measure to the enjoyment and appreciation of Shakespeare's masterpieces in India. The employment of a play within the play for furthering the action of a piece or for developing characters is a favourite device with Shakespeare and to mention instances, the famous "Mouse-Trap" in Hamlet, the interlude of the nine Worthies in Love's Labour Lost, the unforgettable play of Pyramus and Thisbe in "A Midsummer Night's Dream" are easily recalled to the mind

as outstanding illustrations. Such plays are not only used by Hindu dramatists wrought intimately into the main structure, but they are also sanctioned by the canons laid down in dramaturgical treatises. They are technically called *Garbhāṅkas* or *Embryo-play*, and *śāhitya -vyaṅga* (a treatise on Hindu poetics) thus describes them. "A Secondary act which is incorporated into the body of an act, and which has its own prologue, introductions etc and has a scene of opening action (lit. seed) and denouement (lit. fruit) is known as a *Garbhāṅka* (interlude, or a Play within a Play).

Instances of these plays within the play are rare in *Kālidasa*, the greatest name in the Hindu drama, but they are plentiful in the plays of his successors who are read with no less avidity. The first example of this we may quote from *Harsha's Prīṭhivīśikā*. The entire third act of this beautiful drama is occupied with a play performed on the evening of the *Kaumudī* festival. The play is designed to represent how the hero of the main play King *Vatśa* won the hand of his eye-royal queen. *Prīṭhivīśikā* who is a lost princess and is now residing in the royal house in the humble capacity of the queen's maid-in-waiting is assigned the role of the leading lady and another maid in male disguise is employed to play the part of the King. But the King who is in secret love with *Prīṭhivīśikā*, by cunning and stratagem, appears on the stage, assumes the character of an Instructor

in music to Priyadarsikā and makes vehement love to her. The queen is, however, shrewd enough to discover the intrigue and the play is stopped just like the interrupted play in Hamlet.

Bhavabhūti's Uttara-^{Rāma} Carita contains another capital instance of this dramatic device. It is a play that bears resemblance to two of Shakespeare's masterpieces The Winter's Tale and Cymbeline. Rāma, the hero of the play, like Shakespeare's Leontes, has banished his faithful consort, Sītā, and in her exile she bears him two sons Kusa and Lava. Like Guiderius and Arviragus reared by old Belarius in Cymbeline, they have been reared by the hermit poet Vālmīki and have reached youth, their father being wholly ignorant of their existence. In the sixth act Fate relents and the sons are restored to the father, but faithful Sītā has also to be restored to her husband. To this end Bhavabhūti introduces a mimic play which is very much like the masque contained in the last act of Cymbeline. The theatrical representation that is employed in this play is of the following description:-

Rāma, pining away in grief for the exiled queen comes to the banks of the Ganges and to the hermitage of Vālmīki. A play written by the holy sage is presented before him. In it are enacted the events following Sītā's banishment and the circumstances regarding the birth of Rāma's sons. Sītā's character which was under a cloud of unjust suspicion that led to her banishment

is cleared. The pathos of the play fills Rāma's heart and he is moved to tears and is seized with an ardent desire for the return of the exiled queen. To his intense surprise and overwhelming joy he discovers that the fictitious sītā of the theatrical representation like Hermione of the "Winter's Tale", is his wife.

In "Ratnāvalī" the magic scene in which the magician Sombara-siddhī performs his marvels and conjures up wonders before the eyes of the astonished King and Queenⁿ by waving cunningly his bunch of peacock feathers at once calls up in the mind Prospero's beautiful masque or dumbshow in Shakespeare's Tempest. The magic wand of Prospero waves and calls forth surprises for the wondering eyes of Ferdinand and Miranda. In Rāja Śekhara's Karpūracmējarī, there is a similar subsidiary performance in which ~~of~~ sorcery is employed. The Magician Bhairavānanda exercises his wizardry and creates on the stage the vision of the lovely maiden who is the heroine and the King, the hero, loses his heart to her. This scene may very well be compared to the scene in Marlowe's Faustus in which Faustus beholds the splendid vision of the non-parcill Helen of Troy.

These contrivances which are the common feature of the classical Sanskrit drama and the English Romantic drama are quite unknown to the classical drama of Greece and Rome and are against its very spirit.

The subject matter of the Hindu drama thus never ~~is~~

aims at rigid simplicity. While the unity of interest or action is never sacrificed, the dramatist has full liberty to diversify his subject matter and has often the daring and the requisite skill to do it. The dramatic canons lay down explicit sanction for such a practice. In *Deśarūpa* which is the most authoritative critique on dramatic composition and which is based on the earliest treatise of this kind viz: *Bharata-Nāṭya Sūtram*, the subject matter of a drama is divided into two classes, one *Ādhikārika* i.e. principal or material, and the other *Prāsāṅgika* or accessory or subordinate. The latter again is subdivided into *Patākā* or an episode which is almost continuous or runs almost through the whole of the play and *Prakṛī* or an episodic incident of short duration. The object of the *Prāsāṅgika* or subordinate subject matter is described as being the furthering of the principal incident. Thus both in theory and practice the Hindu drama conforms in this respect to the romantic drama of Shakespeare. One form of this accessory subject matter has been, as we have seen, in the shape of a play within the play itself and parallels are to be seen in Shakespeare's dramas. According to the technical terminology of Sanskrit dramaturgy it is of the *Prakṛī* type or a short-lived episodic incident. Episodic stories of the *Patākā* type running almost parallel with the main story of the play are also to be found in Sanskrit plays.

and we know they are not rare in Shakespeare. In *Mālatī - Mādhava* " which is called the "Romeo and Juliet" of Sanskrit dramatic literature the plot is two-fold. The principal is the love of *Mālatī-Mādhava* *, the chief hero and the heroine. The accessory is the love of *Makaranda* and *Madayantika* who are the hero and the heroine of the *Paṭākā* that runs through the whole of the play. In *Mr̥cchakatī* or *Toy - Cart* the deposition of the King *Pālaka* also is such an episodic story and is intimately woven into the texture of the main plot. The play is a masterpiece of complex structure. Incidents and situations are crowded together but the unity of action is maintained. Prof. Wilson very justly observes: " The action, if it wants other unities, has the unity of interest and proceeds with a regular though diversified march, to its final development. The interest is rarely suspended and in every case the apparent interruption is made subservient to the common design".

As regards the unity of time, it is observed in the Hindu drama in a very modified form. As far as the whole play is concerned, it is non-existent, but within an act itself, it is observed. According to the critics *Bharata* and *Viṇayakya* who are followed in this respect by the author of *Sāhitya - Darpaṇa*, the business of an act should not exceed the doings of a single day. But, sometimes it might be allowed to fall within twenty-four hours. There are also rules to limit the time between one act and another, which is theoretically

confined to one year. But in practice this rule is always contravened and the time is much longer. In his admirable time analysis of some Sanskrit plays, Prof. A.V. Jackson arrives at the following conclusion :-

"The Sanskrit drama and the Elizabethan stage resemble each other with regard to the unity of time. The five acts of Kālidāsa's "Mālavikāgnimitram" are comprised within about a week, the action of Shakaspeare's Romeo and Juliet likewise covers about the same length of time. On the other hand, as in Cymbeline and the Winter's Tale, years elapse between the first and last acts of Śakuntalā and Vikramorvaśī of the same author. A Kālidāsa and Shakaspeare, despite the objections which a critic may raise, allow the hero and the heroine to meet and fall in love at the opening of the drama and to have their son appear as a well-grown youth at the close of the play. Āyu and Sarvadaman are the Guidarius and Arviragus of the Hindu stage. In Bhavabhūti's "Uttara-Rāma-Carita" as many as twelve years elapse between the first and the second act.

As regards the third unity viz : the unity of place this is entirely an unknown quantity in the Sanskrit drama. Restrictions of this kind are justly regarded as interference with the freedom of the dramatic art and are not given a thought either in ^{the} critiques or the dramas themselves. We find scenes constantly

shifting from one part of the earth to another and even celestial regions are included in the journeys of the heroes. The affinity that Sanskrit drama shows in this respect with the Romantic drama is noteworthy and the contrast it makes here with the classical drama of Europe should not be ignored.

If anything more conclusive were needed to establish the origin and development of the classical Sanskrit drama as independent of any Greek influence, the conspicuous absence of tragedy from the Hindu repertoire ought to be a sufficiently convincing proof of this nature. Much as we may deplore this imperfection of the Hindu mind in respect of a purely tragic conception, it is to be welcomed as a fact which demolishes the theory of the Greek origin of the Hindu drama. Very rigid rules circumscribe the liberty of the Sanskrit dr̥śit drama in this respect and these rules of the grammarians are strictly obeyed by all \neq dramatists. The conclusion of the play is never allowed to be a calamitous one and even the representation on the stage of deeply tragic incidents, such as death and fight, is strictly forbidden. Thus purely tragic plays are not to be found in the whole range of Sanskrit literature. But the Sanskrit plays are mostly mixed productions, In them levity and laughter will be found shaking hands with the serious and the thoughtful.

In its exclusion of highly tragic incidents and tragic endings the Sanskrit drama, no doubt, offers a

notable contrast to the Elizabethan drama, but points of contact are again established in their character as mixed productions of intermingling comic and tragic incidents and situations. Truly speaking, as Schlegel observes, the terms tragedy and comedy as understood by the ancients are hardly applicable to the greatness of English romantic drama of the Elizabethan period and this may be said to be true of the great body of Sanskrit plays as well.

It is a very difficult matter to label the existing Sanskrit plays--- plays with ~~epic~~ that would appear familiar to European ears. In Sanskrit critical literature on dramas, there is an exhaustive classification of plays and they evidently fell under one or the other description but this Hindu classification except in the case of the--- Prahasana or farical productions has no counterpart in the critical Vocabulary of Europe concerning dramas. As an unfortunate ending is strictly forbidden in the Hindu Plays Tragedy, we have seen, has no place in the Hindu drama. Pure comedies and farical plays were known to the Hindus as the critical treatises on dramatic ~~plays~~ ~~was known~~ ~~to the Hindus~~---as the composition will prove conclusively; but the specimens which have survived the ravages of time and political turmoils are all of a much later period. In the existing specimens of the classical drama pathos and mirth make a happy blend and the conclusion is always one satisfying to the feelings. The name

of comedy, however, will hardly suit their character. If it were absolutely necessary to name them, the epithet of tragi-comedy as applied to Elizabethan dramas of a particular type is the only one that suggests itself to our mind and may with some reasonable approximation describe the character of most of these productions in which pathos and comic elements enter in equal proportions and the catastrophe is always a fortunate and satisfying one.

In the choice of subject—matters for dramatic handling Hindu dramatists as represented in the extant plays exercise very little freedom. Their power in this respect was evidently restricted by the rules forged by grammarians in the critical treatises. This has led to a good deal of artificiality which makes them vastly inferior to Shakespearian productions. But even within the limit allowed them by the framers of dramatic canons, they hardly take a full circuit. This conclusion is irresistibly forced on the mind after a perusal of these plays. Love is the invariable theme of the Hindu dramatist and the predominant element of dramatic intrigue and interest in his work. Along with love, heroism is given a place of equal prominence in dramatic compositions by the writers of treatises on the dramatic art, but in the existing plays it is seldom the dominant note. The other sentiments such as the odious, the furious, the comic, the pathetic, the terrible are all allowed to be laid under ~~control~~

contribution, but only as ministers to the all-absorbing and omnipotent erotic sentiment. But even this love has not that richness and variety with which Shakespeare's genius invests it, those hundred hues in which it is shot in the romantic pages of that immortal dramatist. The sameness of plot is thus a just reproach of the Hindu dramas and has often led to very severe strictures being passed on them. We must not, however, allow ~~our~~ ourselves to be blinded by this monotony of subject-matters to the skill, which is as great as the Shakespearian skill, with which Hindu dramatists can work the details of the plot and achieve a masterly development of the intrigue. It is unhappily true that very little fertility of imagination is shown by them in the invention of new and original plots, but it is a travesty of the truth to say that these plots are ill or cumbrously worked out. A capital instance of a very successful play of complex situations and incidents has already been alluded to viz : the "Toy cart and Prof. , Wilson's admiring observations on the great skill of management evinced by the dramatist have been fully quoted.

Here we may fitly refer to the power of characterization displayed by Hindu dramatists. Plots and situations being very much restricted and circumscribed in their nature, it is only natural that there is a good deal of restriction in the choice of the dramatic personae too. The characters are mostly of a stereotyped nature

but, in spite of their lack of variety, there is fidelity to life and nature in their portrayal almost as much as it is to be found in Shakespeare. As Prof. Macdonnell very justly remarks, Hindu dramatists do not create types of characters, but living men and women strongly individualised and clearly differentiated from one another. To refer to some instances, we may again take up the "Toy Cart" and very subtle and delicate discrimination in traits will be found in the companion-characters of the two captains of the Watch and the two executioners. This is almost Shakespeare in whose portrayal of life, as in real life, there are no two human beings alike in character. The Shakespearean mastery of powerful characterisation is also to be noticed in the figure of Samsthānaka - the King's brother-in-law who is the villain of the piece. He is a masterpiece of character-portrayal, a monster incarnate, but his character is never allowed to depart ^{from} ~~for~~ the ^{truth} ~~truth~~ of life. In Kalidasa's Vikramorvashī, the Queen and the nymph Urvasī - the two lovers of the King are finely and ~~dis-~~ discerningly contrasted in their attachment to the King. One is haughty and imperious in her love, yet withal irresolute; the other, timid but resolute in her devotion.

The Hindu dramatic canons also lay down the sources from which the story of the drama should be taken but here the choice left to the dramatist would seem to be ample. The story may be drawn from ~~his~~ history

or legends, two almost synonymous terms with the ancient Hindus. It may also be a pure invention by the author or it may be a mixture of history and invention. Though there is no explicit mention of contemporary life and manners as a possible source it may be held that this special source is fully covered by the class "Invention." The "Toy Cart" before alluded to is a very illuminating picture of the Hindu life of the age in which it was composed. But, as a general practice, we find in most of the existing plays, that legend or history is the mine which is most laboriously worked. Of course it is always such legend or history as has gathered round it the halo of romance and an amazing accretion of fabulous incidents.

We have now finished our survey of the broad characteristics of the classical Hindu drama, studied from the existing plays as well as from the critical treatises on the art of dramatic composition. We have referred to the second source as sparingly as possible for they are mostly occupied with futilities of niceties and hair-splitting discussions and classifications. Broad principles are very rare and wherever they have been found and whenever they have been thought serviceable for our purpose, we have laid them under contribution. In this outline of the general features of the Hindu drama we have not refrained from touching on such aspects as appear to be artificial and as might be held to differentiate the Indian Drama from Shakespeare's work.

Our object is not to prove the exact resemblance of the two types, thus leading to the suppression or ignoring of differences where they may exist. Our object is attained when it can be established that there is so much affinity between these two kinds of dramas that the appreciation and approbation of the one kind may easily lead to the appreciation and approbation of the other kind. We feel confident that our aim in this respect has been more than fulfilled. The differences which the Hindu type exhibits from the Shakespearean type are not so material as to interfere in any way with the proper estimation of the qualities of Shakespeare's dramas. On the other hand, these differential characteristics which make the Hindu drama more or less artificial, which are easily seen to place undue restrictions on the freedom of the dramatic writer, only heighten the admiration of the educated Hindu for the great genius of Shakespeare, which is as free as the air, and acknowledges nothing but the restraint of its art.

There are various other minor details and devices in which the Indian drama shows a remarkable resemblance to the romantic drama of England, specially to the dramas of Shakespeare. We cannot reasonably exclude them from our study in the present chapter for they in their own measure contribute to that loving and intimate appreciation of Shakespearean dramas in India, which has been found mainly to rest on the broad features of agreement. In the unfettered use of prose alternating

with verse. the liberal employment of puns and comic distortions of words and phrases in the Hindu drama, we can clearly discern its affinity with the romantic drama. Even in the limited sphere of dramatic personae, Shakespear's fool has a very close counterpart in the Vidūṣaka of the Sanskrit drama. Some of the contrivances used for promoting the action of the plot in the Sanskrit drama have also their close parallels in Shakespear's works. One of them, and the most important one, which was unknown to the Greeks or the Romans viz : the employment of a play within the play for forwarding the action of the play, has been fully discussed in connection with the unity of time. Three more such devices of a minor character, which are rather striking in their likeness may be instanced here. They are (1) use of intoxication on the stage as a humorous device (2) writing of letters (3) restoration of the dead to life. In Rājasekhara's Karpūra Mañjarī (900 A.D.) above alluded to, the magician " Bhairavānanda " is an instance of the first kind. He enters before the presence of the king and the first--kind- queen, a little the worse for drink, singing a rollicking song that would do credit to any shakespearean toper. We give below an English translation of the song by C.R. Lomen (C.F. Karpūra Mañjarī. Edited by Stan Konow) and though it might be thought to offend the sense of decency of the present age it does not sin in this respect any more than a song of conviviality in Shakespear. The song

is as follows:-

"As for black book and spell, - they may all go to hell!
My teacher's excused me from practice for trance,
With drink and with women we fare mighty well,
As on- to salvation- we merrily dance !

A fiery young wench to the ^{altar} ~~latter~~ I've lad,
Good meat I consume, and I guzzle strong drink,
And it all comes as alms, - with a paltry for my bed,
What better religion could any one think !

Gods Vishnu and Brahm and the others may preach
of salvation by trance, holy rites, and the Vedies, ~~and~~
'Twas Uma's fond lover alone that could teach,
Us salvation plus brandy plus fun with ladies."

In Harsha's *Nāgārāja*, there is a remarkable instance of the same kind. In this play, when the wedding festivities of the hero are proceeding, enters the parasite Sekhara heavily drunk, hardly able to maintain himself on his legs, ^{his} head crowned with flowers. His drunkenness leads to his mistaking the fat and portly Vidūshaka or buffoon as his sweetheart in disguise. His tipsy condition and ridiculous mistake provoke a good deal of mirth. The family resemblance that this picture presents to Shakespeare's unforgettable Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Toby Belch and Maria can hardly fail to be noticed. In "*Mālavikā Agnimitram*" the queen Irūvati, when she finds herself jilted, takes to drink for consolation and appears tipsy on the stage and presents rather an undignified spectacle, but it contributes no less to the amusement. Letters are profusely used by Shakespeare for promoting the action of a play and we all know the significance of Hamlet's love-letters to poor Ophelia, Orlando's missives to

Rosalind, the billets-doux that passed between Benedick and Beatrice, Macbeth's letter to his partner in life and crime, and the letters of state that removed Othello from his office. An equally important part is played by letters in Sanskrit plays, but, of course, in fewer instances and in a less variety of circumstances. The two outstanding instances are Śakuntalā's love letter to Duṣyanta and Urveśī's (in Vikramorvaśī) unique device of scratching upon a leaf her confession of love for Puruṣarava. They are also intended for the same purpose of furthering the action of the plays and completely achieve it. There is also an instance of formal state letters being indited and despatched on important state-business in "Mālavikā Agnimitram". The third device viz : resuscitation of the dead to life to further dramatic action and intrigue is equally present in Shakespeare and the plays of Hindu dramatists. The return to life of Vasanta - Senā, the heroine in "Toy Cart", is a very cleverly manipulated artifice which relieves the tension of a highly worked up critical situation and resolves a tangle that threatens to kill the hero in its inextricable coils. There is a fourth device which is equally interesting in its application. It is the contrivance of being ~~vi-~~ visible to the audience and invisible to the individuals on the stage. In Shakespeare the ghost of Hamlet, that of Banquo, Ariel in the Tempest all play this trick very successfully for the purpose of the dramatic action. In Kālidāsa's Vikram^ourvaśī, Urveśī and Chitralokhā are

similarly invisible to the persons on the stage- the King and Vidūṣake and with as good affect. Here it is that Urveśī's declaration of love is inscribed on a Bhurja (a kind of birch) leaf. In "Uttara-Rāma -Carita" Rama meets the banished Sita, hears her voice and recognises her touch, but the supernatural powers make her invisible to him. As a result, his distractions are touchingly increased and the contrivance fills the audience with the most affecting emotions.

Chapter IV.

Hindu works on dramaturgy and poetics. Their contents and canons in their bearing on India's mental equipment for the study of the European drama.

To complete the picture we have endeavoured to depict in the preceding chapters of the Hindu mental background in regard to dramatic studies, it is necessary to devote some attention to Hindu critical literature on the drama. In course of our previous discussions, allusion was made to it now and then, but a more comprehensive and sustained reference would not be found altogether out of place.

The object which this account of the Hindu theory of dramaturgy is intended to serve may be indicated at the very outset. We have contended that the Hindu drama is of independent growth and indigenous nurture. This contention will receive strong confirmation from the present study, for in no literature, ancient or modern, there is a parallel to this highly elaborate critical dramatic literature. We have already discovered analogies between the Hindu drama and the Shakespearian drama, a knowledge of which predisposes the Hindu mind to sympathetic appreciation of Shakespearian masterpieces. The present study will discover, among the multitude of technical terms and formulas evolved by Hindu grammarians for the regulation of dramatic composition, some laws of the drama that are of its very essence and form

predisposing factors in the appreciation of dramatic literature in general. Lastly, it will be found that in India Shakespeare came in violent conflict with artificial rules and inventions no less formidable than the classical laws dating from the siècle de Louis XIV that confronted at one time Shakesperian appreciation in Europe and that it was a new victory for him to overcome and overthrow them. After a study of these Sanskrit critiques on dramas,, the mind is really filled with wonder that the present-day drama of India is so free from classical traditions and is so much after the free pattern of the English drama.

"Bharata - Nāṭya-Śāstra" or the rules of dramaturgy by Bharata has ^{already} ~~already~~ been mentioned. This is the oldest work extant on the subject of dramatics and its reputed author Bharata Muni is also the legendary father of the Hindu drama. To modern investigators, however, Bharata's claim as the originator of the Hindu drama appears hardly admissible, for the very fact of his being the author of a critique on dramas does not consist with such a claim. Criticism always follows, and never precedes creation, and elaborate and comprehensive canons for a particular kind of composition can only be formulated and laid down as positive injunctions when that particular kind has been sufficiently long in vogue and has securely established itself as a type.

The date of Bharata has not yet been ascertained with anything approaching certainty. Mahamahopadhyaya

Hare Prasad Sastri, the great Bengalee Orientalist, places it in the second century B.C. (J.B.A.S., Vol. V. 1909-10, P. 351.). We take this date as the most recent pronouncement of authority on the disputed subject and it will be seen that it fits in with the hypothesis which we have built with regard to the time in which the classical Sanskrit drama might be regarded as having been stereotyped in the form in which it exists to-day.

Though Indian tradition unflinchingly points to Bharata as the writer of the first work on dramatic art, the claim appears to be hardly tenable. We have already mentioned that Panini (who flourished about 350 B.C.) speaks of Śilāli and Kṛāśva , writers of Nāṭya sūtras or texts for actors. Mahamahopadhyaya Hare Prasad Sastri already quoted arrives at the same conclusion (J.B.A.S. 1909/Oct. Vol. V. P. 358). " There was a vast literature in the dramatic art before this long work (Bharata - Nāṭya - Sāstra) in sloka metre was compiled, and that literature had already undergone five or six different stages of development . " Again, " Gradually the literature became bulky and it became necessary to write compendious treatises, mnemonic verses, and so on, till in the 2nd century B. C. the whole of the vast literature was brought into a compendious harmony in what we now have as Bharata - Nāṭya - Sāstra ". (J. B. A. S. 1909 Oct Vol. V. P. 358.).

Bharata deserves credit as the writer of the first great compendium of the Hindu dramatic science, not as the

originator of the drama or the dramatic science. His work is almost encyclopaedic in its nature. He often says that whatever is useful to the world is useful to the dramatist and the actor. So all the arts of life in ancient times are depicted in his work.

The following brief resume of its contents will reveal the nature of the compilation which he so creditably performed.

Bharata's monumental work contains 38 chapters 1. and deals with an astonishing variety of subjects of dramatic interest. The first Chapter contains a history of the origin of the drama and is headed Nāṭyotpatti. In chapters 2nd and 3rd entitled Maṇḍapavidhānam and Raṅgadhāivatapūjavidhānam, minute instructions are given regarding the construction of the theatre-house and the way in which it should be furnished and the opening and other ceremonies should be performed. The fourth chapter called Tāṇḍavalakṣaṇam discusses the nature and rules of dances, specially of the Tāṇḍava variety. The next Chapter named Pūrvarāṅgavidhānam shows how the Pūrvarāṅga or the prelude must be performed. The sixth chapter called Rasādhyāya treats of the sentiments in minute

1. In the edition available to me viz: Bharata - Nāṭya Sāstra (Kavyamala series, Edited by Pandit Durga Prasad, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, there are only 37 Chapters. Both M. H. Sastri (J. B. A. S. 1909 Oct Vol V) and Mr. H. H. Dhruva (The Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review and Oriental and Colonial Record 1896, 3rd series Vol 2) mention 38 chapters as found in the texts used by them.

details. In the seventh which is named Bhāva- vyāñjanā is taught the practice and expression of the sentiments and the states corresponding to them. The ^{8th Chapter called} Upāṅgūbhīnaye lays down rules for the gesticulations of the minor limbs of the head, eyes, nose, cheeks, lips, face, neck etc and the ninth called Aṅgūbhīnaye frames rules for the motions of hands single and joined, feet, chest, sides etc, in the matter of acting and dancing. The tenth named Cārīvidhānam and the eleventh named Mandala- Kālpānam treat of these two specialised forms of motion. The twelfth called Gatipracāra discusses motions or gaits of different characters. In the thirteenth chapter we have real dramatics and a definition of the ten forms of the drama or rūpakas. The ^{14th} ~~fourth~~ and the fifteenth chapters named Chando- Vidhānam ~~of~~ define and illustrate the different metres to be used in dramas. The sixteenth called Alamkāra - Lakṣaṇa discusses the Alamkāras or figures of speech used in ~~dramas~~ dramas. The 17th chapter called Vāgūbhīnaye - Kākusvara-vidhānam gives an account of Prākṛit ^{idioms}, names of the seven dialects, directions for the variation of the pitch of the voice in dramatic dialogues. The 18th chapter gives a more comprehensive discussion of the forms of dramas and is named Dasa-rūpa- Lakṣaṇam. The 19th chapter called Sandhi- Nirūpaṇam gives an account of the sandhis or junctures of the drama and the 20th named Vṛtti- Vikāśa describes

the *vr̥ttis* or styles. The 21st called *Āhāryābhinaya* ^āconcerns itself with an account of dresses, ornaments, decorations to be used in acting and the 22nd called *Sāmānyābhinaya* contains hints with regard to acting in general. The 23rd Chapter named *Vaiśiṣṭhānamādhya* gives a classification of courtesans. The 24th called *Strī-Puṁsopacārādhyāya* and *Nāyaka-Lakṣaṇam* gives practical hints to male and female actors. The 25th named *Citrābhinayādhyāya* describes acting by gestures. The 26th is entitled *Prakṛti-Vikalpanādhyāya* and deals with the assignment of parts according to the grace, delicacy, force or spirit of their execution. The 27th called *Siddhivijayāṅkaka* describes what success or accomplishment of the dramatic object means. The 28th and the 29th are called *Jāti-Lakṣaṇa* and *Jātividhāna* and deal with the primary notes of the Indian gamut and their application. The chapters 30-35 are given to discussion regarding music and musical instruments. The chapters 36-38 are full of practical hints regarding the parts of Gods, *Rakṣasas* (monsters), Kings, Generals, Ministers, Hecatebearsers, Chamberlains, Buffoons and the followers of the King. They also contain hints as to the nature and appearance of those persons who should be assigned these parts.

This work of Bharata is the basis of all subsequent Hindu works on dramatics, and to some extent, on poetics. In fact, the "*Daśarūpa*" of Dhanañjaya, which is at present more widely known than Bharata's

original treatise and which is accepted to-day as the standard work on Hindu dramaturgy, is based on Bharata. The *Daśarūpa*,* in contradistinction to its original, has the unique merit of confining itself to pure dramatics. We have seen how wide in scope and varied in treatment Bharata - *Nāṭya - Śāstra* is. It is in the words of G. C. O. Haas (Introduction to G. C. O. Haas's edition of "*Daśarūpa*" - New York, Columbia University Press) "too cumbersome for use, diffuse in style, unsystematic in arrangement." It is small wonder that Bharata's work should come to be superseded by Dhanañjaya's treatise. In our exposition of the Hindu dramatic theory, we shall therefore, principally rely on the "*Daśarūpa*".

But before we leave Bharata finally and pass on to Dhanañjaya's work, we should quote a passage from the "*Nāṭya Śāstra*" in which the ideal of the Hindu drama is vividly set forth. This fundamental conception of the drama is rigidly adhered to in all later writings and it informs all dramatic productions of the Hindus. It will also be seen that this ideal is nothing different from the ideal which is of the European drama of the present day or from the ideal that can be associated with the true drama.

This is the ideal of the Hindu drama depicted by Bharata :-

"Trailokyaśreyasya sarvasya nāṭyam bhāvanākīrtanam
kvaścidbandhah (dvandvoh) kvaścitrīḍa kvaścidarthah
kvaścitśameh

Kvacidāsyaṃ (hāsyam) kvacidyuddham kvacitkūmah kvacidvadhaḥ
 Dharmādharma-apravṛttānāṃ kāmāḥ (t) kāmārthasevīnām
 Nigrahaṃ durvinītānāṃ matātānāṃ damanakriyā
 Klībānāṃcāpi dyū (yū ?) nām vā utsāheśvaraṃnānām
 Abodhānāṃ vibodhasā vaidagdhyaṃ vidusāmāpi
 Iśvarānāṃ vivodhasā (vilāsasā) sthairyam duḥkhārditasya
 Sarpopajivīnāmartho yatirudvignaśtasām
 Nānābhāvopasampānan nānāvesthāntarātraham
 Lokapravṛttānāṃkaraṇam nātyama-tanmayā kṛtam
 Uttamādhamamāhyānāṃ narāṇāṃ karmasamśṛjā-yam
 Hitopadeśajānanam dhṛti-kṛdā-sukhōdikṛt
 Duḥkhārtānāṃ samarthaṇāṃ sokārtānāṃ tapasvīnām
 Vīrāntijānanam kālē nātyamataṇmayā kṛtam
 Dharmyaṃ yasasyamā-yasyam hitam buddhibivardhanam
 Lokopadeśajānanam nātyametadbhaviṣyati
 Na tecoḥrutam na tecoḥilpam naśo vidyā naśo/galā
 Nāśau yogo na to karma yannātye-sminnā dr̥ṣyate
 I X I X I X I X
 Iyam svabhāvo lokya sukheduḥkha-samuvitā
 Saṅgēdyabhinayopeto nātyamityabhidhi-yate
 Vedavidyātiḥāsānāmarthānāṃ parikalpanam
 Vinodakaraṇam loke nātyametaadbhaviṣyati "

(Bharata - Nāṭya-Sāstra, Kavyamala series, Edited by Pandit
 Durga Prasad, Nirnaya Sagara Press, Bombay, chapter 1 slokas
 73-86) .

A free rendering in English of the above passage is
 as follows:-

Nāṭya or the drama is a reproduction of the feelings
 of the whole of the three-fold world where in some places
 there is duress (or quarrel), in some sport, in some
 artha, or worldly interest, in some equality or impartiali-
 ty, in some places again there is slavery (or laughter
 and mirth), in some fight, in some slaughter. The drama
 represents those that are engaged in virtue and vice
 pursuing love or desire for its own sake. It repre-
 sents punishment of the wicked and correction and control
 of those that are drunk with pride, also of imbeciles

and of youths elated with pride of power and lustiness. In the drama there is instruction for the unlearned, also enlightenment in skill and proficiency for the learned. In it there is consolation (or delight) for the lords of the world, also there is equanimity for persons afflicted with sorrows. It leads to the fruition of the desires of all that live the lives of dependence and to mental control in the case of those who have troubled and agitated minds. I have created this drama full of the different feelings and states of life - a copy of the world, containing the actions of all classes of men - the high, the middle, and the low-, designed to give good advice, produce intelligence, delight and happiness, to afford recreation to the afflicted, the strong and the able, the grief-laden, the ascetic. It is religious, beneficial, life-giving, intellect-fostering, productive of instructions for the people. There are no such sacred learning, no such arts and sciences, no such skill, no such Yoga or ascetic practice, no such Karma or action, as are not to be seen mirrored in this drama. Natya is the representation by means of gesticulations of the body of this condition of the people, which is a compound of happiness and misery. This Natya shall become in this world the exponent of Vedic lore, history, politics and economics, to the delight of the people. "

It may be said that the nature and the function of the dramatic art, ~~is~~ its value as ~~a~~ means of

education and recreation could not be better described than in the above passage. The drama is a mirror of the world, of life - that sums up the Hindu conception of it and how startlingly alike is Shakespeare's own observation on the same theme.

" ... The purpose of playing, whose end, both at first and now, was and is, to hold, as it were, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and the body of the time, his form and pressure ... " *Hamlet. Act III. Sc. 11.*

In all our discussions of India's mental attitude towards Shakespearian dramas, we should do well to remember this celebrated passage from Bharata and the dramatic ideal that it sets forth. This will explain one of the most & difficult factors that puzzle us in comprehending that full measure of appreciation that Shakespeare has undoubtedly obtained in India. The absence of tragedies from the ancient Hindu dramatic literature, & the total ignorance of the Hindu mind of those two main divisions of the European drama - the Tragedy and the Comedy, have already been mentioned. In "*Bharata Nāṭya Śāstra*" and in "*Daśarupā*" there are positive injunctions against the employment of tragic incidents in dramas:-

*Yuddham rājyabhraṁśo maraṇam nagaroparodhanam caiva
Pratyekṣaṇī tu nāṅko praveśakauḥ samvidhāyānī*

(*Bharata - Nāṭya - Śāstra*, *Kavyamala* series, Edited by

Pandit Durga Prasad, Nirnaya Sagara Press, Bombay, Chapter 18 sloka 19.)

" Battles, revolution, death, seige of a town, should not be represented in an act but must be conveyed by a " Pravasaka " or interlude.

Dūrādhuṇam vadham yu-~~tham~~--puddham rājyedaśādiviplavam
samrodham bhājenam snānam suratam cānulepanam
Ambara-grahayādīni pratyakṣāni na nirdiśet

(Daśarūpa, Edited by G.C.O. Nees, Columbia University press Book 3, sloka 39) .

Long journeys, massacres, battles, overthrow and destruction of ~~king~~ kingdoms and countries, seige, eating, bathing, intercourse, anointing the body, putting on clothes, should not be represented in a play.

In face of these facts, it seems incredible that Shakespearian tragedies could meet with adequate recognition and appreciation from the Hindus. Yet, it is an undeniable fact and after all, not so inexplicable as at the first blush it appears to be, . The ideal drama as conceived in the words of Bharata quoted above does not exclude plays with tragic conclusions. The drama is to copy the world, life and actions in all their phases tragic, comic or ~~be~~ tragic-comic. It is true that the rules that were ~~a~~ subsequently or at the same time framed to give practical affect to this ideal tended to dwarf this ~~ideal~~ ideal ~~tended~~-- and actually led to productions which fall far short of it.

As indicated above, Bharata -Natyā -Sāstra has been

almost fully superseded by a later work which is less ambitious in its scope and which strictly confines itself to rules of dramatic composition. This is the "Dasarupa" composed by Dhananjaya, son of Vishnu in Mālavā in the last quarter of the tenth century A. D. during the reign of Vālpatirāja II or Munja " who belonged to the Paramāra dynasty of Mālavā and succeeded to the throne in 974 A.D. and reigned until about 995 A.D. 1.

From the point of view of the dramatist and the almost semi-divine pronouncements of Bharata are scarcely helpful for they are overlaid with matters that are not strictly dramaturgi-cal. It is for this reason that the "Dasarupa" which aims at being a brief manual of the rules of dramatic writing has obtained, in spite of its comparative modernity, such a wide vogue and has succeeded in eclipsing its original.

Dhananjaya differs very little from Bharata. In fact his sole credit lies in excluding from the scope of his treatment all matters that are not strictly pertinent to the drama and in concise and clear re-statement of the dramatic rules laid down in Bharata's work. The prominence of his work as an authoritative treatise on the subject of dramaturgy will be brought

1 Introduction to George. C.O. Haas's edition of Dasarupa. New York, Columbia University Press. This view is also held by Fitz-Edward Hall in his edition of Dasarupa (Bibliotheca Indica), Calcutta, 1865.

out in the following words of Mr G. C. O. Haas . " Its importance in the eyes of Indian students of the drama is further attested by the numerous citations of its rules and allusions to them in later rhetorical and dramaturgic treatises and in the native commentaries on Hindu plays. In the " Prateparadriya", for example, we find ten quotations from the Dasarupa, the source being indicated in all but one of the cases; three other passages also ascribed to the Dasarupa, are not to be found in our text. The Sahityadarpana, furthermore, not only refers to the Dasarupa and criticizes some of its statements, but bases its treatment of dramaturgy to a great extent on Dhananjaya's work and repeats verbatim or with minor variations a large number of its sections. A similar dependence on the Dasarupa and recognition of its value is found also in the other dramaturgic treatises (Introduction to G. C. O. Haas's edition of the Dasarupa, page XXviii).

This famous work of Dhananjaya will be the main basis of our study of the model of the Hindu drama as fixed by critical canons. It is to be noted that there is no other Sanskrit work on pure dramatics and the when in subsequent ages, with the growth of poetics, the drama came to be regarded as a branch of poetry and began to receive treatment in treatises on ~~po~~ Ars poetica, the dramaturgic portions were directly based on the Dasarupa and only indirectly on Bharata . Netya- Sastre.

The very name of the treatise is significant. The word "Dasarupa" means ten forms and the work receives its name from the ten varieties of dramas that Bharata recognises. This classification of dramas is one of the chief features of the Hindu dramatic conception. The fundamental definitions with which the treatise starts contain, along with the other principal characteristics of the Hindu Drama, the following :-

*Aveshānukṛtīrnatyaṁ rūpam drśyatayocayata
Rūpakam tat samāropād dasādheiva rasāśrayam*
(Dasarupa B 1 , sloka 7, F Hall's edition)

Drama is the imitating of situations (called) representation from having to do with the assumption (of parts by actors), is of ten kinds and its basis is the relish of the sentiments.

The ten principal divisions of the drama are :-

*Nāṭakam saprakaraṇam bhāṇaḥ prahaseṇam dimaḥ
Vyāyoga-samavakāraṇa vīthyaṅkahamṛge/iti*
(Dasarupa B.1 , sloka 8, F.Hall's edition)

The ten forms are Nāṭaka , Prakaraṇa , Bhāṇa , Prahaseṇa , Dima , Vyāyoga , Samavakāra , Vīthi , Āṅka and Ihāmṛge

There are other minor subdivisions (called uparūpakas - 18 in number) falling under these ten principal classes. But we are not concerned with these minor varieties at all. Even of the primary ten forms, only two need be studied by us. One reason for this restriction is that one of them the Nāṭaka represents the typical variety of the ancient Indian drama and the

other is that the works of the best known Hindu dramatists Sudraka, Kalidasa, Harśadatta, Bhavabhūti, Rāja Śekhara, Viśakhadatta, Harapya Bhatta, Kāśmīra , Kṛṣṇamīra fall under these two classes. Educated Indians are generally acquainted with the productions of these great dramatists and the utmost that they may require in foreign dramas for proper appreciation is some conformity to these two well known types. It may also be stated here that the existing Sanskrit literature does not possess any plays illustrative of some of the varieties.

These two varieties are Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa. The Nāṭaka takes the premier place among all these varieties. It is considered to be the play "Per excellence" and is justly regarded as the type of all. Dhanañjay accords it the first ^{treatment} ~~treatment~~ and he justifies himself in the following words :-

Prakṛtīvāda- (prakṛtīvād) atha nyesāṃ bhūyoraśapari-
 Śaṅpūrnalekhaṇatvāc-ca pūrvam nāṭakamūlye
 (Deserupa, F. Hall's edition, Ch.3, Sloka, 1.)

The Nāṭaka receives the first mention because it is the type of the rest, further it contains the relish of all the sentiments and because it satisfies all the conditions of the definitions .

1. M. Schuyler's "A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Drama." The Columbia University Press. See introduction and specially pp. 101-105.

To arrive at a clearer notion of this pre-eminent form, it is necessary to refer to later writers on the poetics. The Nataka is thus defined by Visvanātha Kaviraja in his very popular rhetorical treatise *Sahitya Darpana*:-

Nāṭakam khyātaurttam syātpañcesamdhisamnavi tam
 Vilāsarādhyādiguṇavadyuktam nānavibhūtibhīḥ
 Subhedaḥkhaṣaṇamudbhūti nānārasanīrantaram
 Pañcādikaḥ daseperāstatrāṅkāḥ parikīrtitāḥ
 Prakhyātavamśo rājargīrdhīrodāttaḥ pralāpavān
 Divyatha divyādivyo vā guṇavānnāyako mataḥ
 Eka eva bhevadangī Śrīgēro vīra eva vā
 Aṅgamanye rasāḥ sarva kāryo nirvahanadbhūtaḥ
 Catvāreḥ pañca vā mukhyāḥ kāryavyapriatpūrasāḥ
 Gopucchāgrasamāgram tu bandhanam tasya kīrtitum.

(The *Sahityadarpana*-edited by P. Durga Prasad, N. Sagara Press, Calcutta VI, Sloka 7-11)

The passage is thus translated by Messrs Bellentyne and ^{a Mitra} ~~the~~ -

" The Nataka should have a celebrated story for its plot, be possessed of the five junctures, have the qualities of vivacity, prosperity etc, described, contain or represent personages (characters) contributing to the various properties of the Hero; be abounding with the sentiments of pleasure and pain, as also with a variety of flavours. It is declared that the Nataka should consist of five to ten acts. The hero should be of the sort characterised "high-spirited" but temperate and firm, powerful and virtuous, being either a royal sage of renowned family, or a god or demi-god ; the principal flavour must be one only, being either the Erotic or the Heroic, all other flavours

should be subordinate and the Marvellous exhibited in the fulfilment of the end, or in the last junctura viz, the conclusion. There must be four or five important personages engaged in the business of the hero, and the Nataka must be so composed as to end like a cow's tail.

Vidyānāth in *Pratāparudrayasobhūṣaṇam* thus defines a Nataka :-

*Vīrasrāgāreṇorekaḥ pradhānam yatra varṇyate
Prakhyātanāyakaopetam nāṭakam tadudāhṛtam*

(1. *Pratāparudrayasobhūṣaṇa*, edited by H. Trivedi Kṛmala Senkara Prasankara, Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit series, No. LXV, 1909, Ch. 3, Sloka 33.)

That is called Nataka in which one of the two flavours—the erotic and the heroic—predominates, and which has a celebrated hero.

A comparison of the above three descriptions of the Nataka—the first from *Daśarupā*, the second from *Sāhitya Darpaṇa* and the third from *Pratāparudrayasobhūṣaṇa*—will bring out the 3 essential characteristics of this variety of Indian dramas. It will be observed that the definition given in *Sāhitya—Darpaṇa* which is a later work than *Pratāparudrayasobhūṣaṇa* and much later than *Daśarupā* contains more restrictions and rules for this particular kind of composition than are to be found in the earlier treatises. There are, however, common factors in these definitions and they reveal to us the fundamental characteristics of this form of dramatic composition. The Nataka must be founded on a celebrated story and there

should be one main Rasa or flavour in it which should be either Sragara (erotic) or Vira (heroic), the other--Rasas being introduced to contribute to the development of the principal Rasa.

The next variety with which we are concerned viz the Prakarena varies very slightly from the Nataka. Dhananjaya defines it in the following words:-

*Attha prakarena vrttamatpādyam lokasamīrayam
Amṛta-vipra-vaṇijāmekam kuryyāc-ca nāyakaḥ
Dhīra-prasāntam sōpāyam dharmakūmartha-tāpāram
Sesaṁ nāṭakavat sandhipravēśakarasādīkam*

(Dasarupa- V. Hall's edition, P. 3., Sloka 35- 36)

In a Prakarena the plot ought to be invented but must be consistent with real life. The hero should be a minister a Brahman, or a merchant self-controlled and calm, undergoing misfortunes and devoted to virtue, pleasure and wealth as his chief objects. The rest of its features- junctures, introductions, sentiments or flavours, and the rest- are as in the Nataka. The Prataparudrayasobhasana has this definition :-

*Utpādyanāti-vrttina dhīrasānta-prudhānakam
Sesaṁ nāṭakālyāṅgam bhavet prakarenam hi/ut*

(Prataparudrayasobhasana, Edited by Trivedi Kamesankara Prasanna, Ch. 3, Sloka 35.)

A prakarena is that which has an invented plot, a hero selfcontrolled and calm, and the rest as in the Nataka.

The Schitya Darpana has the following:-

*Phaṇatprakarena vrttina leukikam kavi-kalpitaḥ
Sragarogī nāyakaḥ vipramāyā-bhava-vaṇik
Sōpāyadharmakūmartha-pāro dhīraḥ prasāntakḥ*

Mitra

The translation by Messrs Ballentyne and ~~Das~~ is this "The story of the Prakerand must be mundane or human, being invented by the poet. Love should be the principal sentiment in it, and the hero must be a Brahmin, or a minister, or a merchant of the description called "firm and mild and intent upon meritorious deeds, objects of desire, and wealth, such as are subject to destruction."

These are the two predominant types of ancient Sanskrit drama that have been preserved to us and that are represented in the famous works of Kalidasa and others. The approach to Shakespearian dramas or any foreign drama lies through them and it will be seen that the majority of Shakespearian dramas ^{very well conform to any of these two varieties in their broad} ~~very~~ features. The insistence in these two types is on a celebrated story or an invented one not untrue to life and on the preponderance of one of the two sentiments - the sentiment of love or of heroism. If it is necessary to base Shakespearian appreciation on this artificial demand, Shakespeare will be found to satisfy it in the majority of his works. If he fails anywhere the fundamental idea of the drama that Bharata enunciates will remove any barrier to proper understanding and recognition of Shakespeare's worth. It is on this fundamental conception more than on anything else that India's mental attitude towards Shakespeare is based.

It must have been noticed that in the definitions of a Nataka and a Prakerand great prominence is given to what is termed Rase. The presence of this is

equally insisted on in respect of the other varieties of dramas. Indeed as later rhetorical and poetical treatises reveal, it is, according to the Hindus, the very soul of Kavya or poetry, as well as of the drama which is in Hindu conception synonymous with poetry. The term Kavya or a poem is of very wide application in Hindu literature and is given to any composition irrespective of its being either in prose or verse as soon as it satisfies the condition of being Rasatmakam or flavoured with the poetical sentiment. "Vākyaṁ Rasātmakam Kāvyaṁ - poetry is defined as a sentence the soul whereof is flavour".

It is necessary for us to follow as briefly as we can this theory of Rases through all its developments. It is needless to say that Shakespeare's plays are dramatic poems and the Hindu appreciation of their poetical qualities must be coloured by this theory. Even regarded as mere dramas, the Hindu conception, as we have seen, requires in them the presence and preponderance of a particular Rasa or poetic sentiment, and the combination of as many as possible of the rest in subordination to the master sentiment. From both these points of view, a clear notion of the Rasa theory seems to be demanded.

The first exposition of the Rasa theory is to be met with in Bharata's work. It seems, however, that the theory is older than himself, though he undoubtedly claims the credit of being the first exponent of it.

One Nandikesvara and one or two others are doubtful claimants for the honour of being the originator of the theory. For all practical purposes, however, we may take the theory as being first expounded and applied to dramatics by Bharata. Later, in the 9th century, it first came to be adopted into the poetries and applied to poetical composition by Anandavardhana. The system was next amplified and elaborated as the very soul of poesy by Abhinava Gupta and Viśvanāth Kavirāja in the memorable dictum "Vākyaṁ Rasātmakam Kāvyaṁ" laid its foundation secure as the essence of poetry.

The above is a very brief outline of the history of the theory, which, however, concerns us very little. It is merely to be noted that since the days of Viśvanāth Kavirāja all poetical and dramatic compositions have had to submit themselves to a very rigorous test by the standard of Rasa to prove their literary worth. As far as modern vernacular literatures of India are concerned, literary criticism has no other canon except this which it has inherited from Sanskrit critical literature to the exclusion of all other canons. Modern critical literature in India simply bristles with reference to it and the very common epithet applied in all the Sanskrit-ic languages to a meritorious literary production viz :- "Sarasa" meaning "possessed of Rasa", bears witness to its power.

Let us now study what this Rasa implies and what is

exactly meant by the production of Rasa in a poetical or dramatic composition. It may be remarked at the outset that it is very difficult to render adequately into Western critical terminology this very subtle conception of Rasa. The word Rasa has been variously translated in the language of the west such as "flavour", "relish", "emotion", "Gustation", "taste", "Style", "mood", but none of them adequately explains its character.

Bharata states very simply the theory in the following words:-

"Vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicāri---

"Vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicāri-samyogādresa-nispattiḥ (Bharata Nāṭya Śāstra, p 62)
Dhananjaya thus defines it:

"Vibhāvairanubhāvaiśca sūttvikāirvyabhicāribhāḥ

Ānīyamānaḥ ṅ svādyatvam sthāyībhāvo rasaḥ amṛtaḥ."

(Dasaarupe , B.IV, sloka .1.

The above dictum of Bharata translated stands thus -

"The manifestation or development of the poetic sentiment (i.e. its relish) is brought about by the correlation of Vibhavas i.e. the excitent, anubhavas i.e. the ensuant and vyabhicāribhavas i.e. the accessory". Dhananjaya's definition is only a variation of the above and may be translated as follows:-

"The poetic flavour results as soon as a permanent feeling is brought to a relishable condition by the agency of (1) the excitent, (2) the ensuant, (3)

the involuntary external manifestations of internal feelings ,
(4) the accessory.

The general outline of the dogma of Rasa as fixed from the enunciation of Bharata and accepted by all may be set down as follows:- Rasa is realised when a sthāyibhāva is brought to a relishable condition by the agency of three factors viz (1) Vibhāvas, (2) Anubhāvas, (3) Vyabhicāribhāvas (or Sañcāribhāvas). By sthāyibhāva in poetry and drama are meant certain lasting or permanent conditions of the mind, such as love , grief , anger , fear, disgust etc. The permanent mood constituting the principal theme of ^{^a} composition and running through all other moods like the thread of a garland, cannot be overcome by those akin to it or those opposed to it, but can only be re~~in~~reinforced. The factors which respectively excite, follow and strengthen the sthāyibhāva or the permanent mood are known as Vibhāva Anubhāva and vyabhicari- bhāva translated by Messrs. Ballantyne and ^{^a} Mitra ~~as~~ as the excitant, the ensuant and the accessory. An excitant is that which renders the extremely ^{subtle} ~~subtle~~ permanent emotion capable of being sensed, an ensuant is that which makes it sensed and an accessory is that which gives an impetus to it.

A concrete example will make the above a little more clear. Let us take, for instance, the sthāyibhāva of Rati, i.e. the more or less permanent mood of love used as the principal theme of a composition. This permanent mood will form the foundation of the Sāgara--Rasa Śṛṅgāra

Rasa or the erotic poetic sentiment and its relish in this particular composition. The excitants in this case would be the women and the season, the ensuants amorous glances, embrace etc., the accessories transient subordinate feelings of modesty, joy, anxiety etc. Thus through the agency of these three factors, the feeling of love is raised to a state of relish called *Sringāra Rasa*, in which lies the essence of poetic or æsthetic enjoyment as far as this particular composition is concerned.

The *Sthāyī-bhāvas* or the permanent moods or sentiments are the ultimate ground basis of a poetic or dramatic work. These are eight or nine in number according to the number of sentiments, *Rati* or love, *Hāsa* or mirth, *Śoka* or sorrow, *Krodha* or anger, *Utgāha* or energy, *Bhīti* or Bhaya Fear, *Nindā* or Jugupsā disgust, *Vismaya* Wonder, *Ānā* or Virrode, Quietism, (not admitted universally as a proper sentiment for dramatic treatment) are the nine permanent moods. These permanent conditions when brought to a relishable condition by the agency of their respective excitants, ensuants and accessories give rise to corresponding nine poetical flavours, viz: the Erotic, the Comic, the Pathetic, the Furious, the Heroic, the Terrible, the Odious, the Marvellous and the Quietistic. It will be seen from the above that Rasa or poetical flavour or relish is nothing but the psychic condition produced in the mind of the reader or the hearer by the underlying emotion employed as the theme of a composition, aided and strengthened by the excitants, the ensuants, and the accessories.

Bharata's definition of Rasa and his explanation of its manifestation are very simple. He uses a very picturesque simile to drive his point home. He says "Just as a beverage is accomplished through various seasoning articles and herbs, so the permanent mood, the *sthāyibhāve* strengthened and reinforced by various *bhāvas*, attain to the state of Rasa." Rasa is so nomenclatured because its taste or relish constitutes its essence. The *Sthāyibhāve* or the permanent mood is, in short, the foundation of Rasa, the essence of which consists in *Āsvāda* or relish, while the *vibhāvas*, the *anubhāvas* and the *Vyabhicāri-bhāvas* merely contribute to its final development or evolution.

The very simplicity of Bharata's enunciation, however, involves a great deal of vagueness. Bharata leaves unsaid and unexplained what exactly the correlation of the three factors the *vibhāvas*, the *Anubhāvas*, the *vyabhicāribhāvas* implies in the manifestation of Rasa. He also remains equally ambiguous as to what this process of the manifestation of Rasa exactly means. He equally fails to indicate what precise relation the three co-operating and contributing factors bear to the final result Rasa.

This ambiguity on the part of Bharata and an effort on the part of later rhetoricians to solve the above problems with philosophical exactitude have led to the formulation of four different theories about Rasa. These four schools of thought are known as follows:-

1. *Utpatti-vāda* school of Bhaṭṭa Lollata.
2. *Anumiti-vāda* school of Śrī Śaṅka

3. Bhakti- vāda school of Phatta -Nāyaka.
4. Vyakti- Vāda school of Abhinava Gupta.

It is unnecessary for us to discuss these theories at any length. The first school ~~is~~ holds that Rasa is produced and hence is called the theory of production (utpatti- vāda). The second school holds that Rasa is inferred and hence it is known as the theory of inference (Ananiti- vāda). The third holds that Rasa is enjoyed and hence is named the theory of inference--(Ananiti--- enjoyment (Bhakti-vāda). The fourth maintains that Rasa is suggested and hence it is known as the theory of suggestion (vyakti-vāda).

Abhinava Gupta's theory is the one that is generally accepted by rhetoricians and is associated with the Dhvani school of poetry or the school of suggestion, the last among the four schools to be evolved. On account of its being in general acceptance and favour and owing to its importance as the last development of critical thought in regard to literature , it requires some exposition. According to this school of thought, there are in the soul latent impressions of feelings which we once experienced. These latent impressions (vāsantī) are roused when we read a poem which describes these feelings or when we see them exhibited in a drama. By universal sympathy we become part and parcel of the same feelings and imagine ourselves in that condition. Thus the feeling in question is raised to a state of relish designated Rasa in which consists the essence of poetic enjoyment.

This view has been taken up and continued by all later

writers on rhetoric and the author of "Sahitya-Darpana"—Visvanath Kavireja—in a very well known sloka has raised the Hindu theory of aesthetic emotion or Rasa to a transcendental plane.

"Sattvadrakṣādakṣānda svaprakāśānandacīmayāḥ
Vedyāntarasparsasūnyo Brahmāsvādesahodarah
Lokottaracamatkārāprāṇaḥ kaiscit pramātrbhin
Svākārevedabhīmatvenāyamāsvādyato rasah
Rajas tamobhāyāmasprastam manah Sattvamihooyato

The above extract from Visvanatha lays down the philosophical basis of the apprehension of Rasa and brings out the eight or nine characteristics of the aesthetic emotion as it is conceived by the Hindus. In the first place, it is held that there is an intrinsic relation between the aesthetic emotion and those functions of the mind, which cooperate in producing moral emotions, so that the same units of the mind as are operative in moral emotions come into play at the time the aesthetic emotion is awakened. Our aesthetic nature is not essentially different from our moral nature.—the two are but the two aspects of the operations of the same mental nature. It should not be inferred from this that according to the Hindus the object of artistic creation is to preach moral laws or instructions. What is intended to be conveyed is simply this, that aesthetic experiences are analogous to moral experiences as the same mental chord vibrates in their production; but the *modus operandi* of the vibration is different in each case. In the second place, it is held that an aesthetic emotion

is a permanent whole. It is indivisible. It is true that the experience or enjoyment of an aesthetic emotion lies through a series of subsidiary passing emotions, but these subordinate accessory = feelings are not constituents of the dominant aesthetic emotion. Their business is to nourish the permanent aesthetic emotion and discover it for us. In the picturesque language of *Manojaya*^I they rise up and go down like waves in the ocean. The dominant aesthetic emotion exists in and for itself, not as a part, not even as a whole of which the subsidiary emotions are constituents. It is a whole existing by itself, in itself and for itself. Thirdly, the aesthetic emotion is held to be self-manifesting. No doubt the aesthetic emotion cannot be lived through, experienced and enjoyed without the aid of the accessory emotions, yet as their nature is distinctly different from its nature their manifestation is not its manifestation. Its manifestation is- cannot be expressed in other terms than itself and no other value can be substituted for its value. It thus not only stands by itself + but its expression also is fundamentally unique and self-manifesting. Next, the pleasure that is derived from aesthetic emotion is described. It is called "Ananda" or bliss. This pleasure which forms intrinsic part of the aesthetic emotion

1. Anurūpa B. IV, Sloka 8. Viśeṣa-ābhinihāna
 caranto vyabhicārīnāḥ / sthāyina-ānanda-irvogaḥ khalolāḥ
 pūrīḥ.

is of a higher nature than the ordinary pleasures of the senses. It is admitted even by a confirmed modern hedonist that there is distinction between pleasures and our own experience tells us that the pleasure of moral approbation has a tone in it that marks it out from other pleasures. The same higher tone is present in the pleasure derived from aesthetic experiences and the Hindu aesthetic theory lays special stress on it, so that the hyper—physical nature of it may not be lost sight of. It is next said that the aesthetic emotion has for its intrinsic part not only this higher pleasure but also the principle of cognition i.e. experience, though it does not involve the cognised states. In fact this latter trait distinguishes it from other mental states. It is not a cognised conceptual state. The aesthetic emotion has no well out shape and thus it is not possible to have an image or memory of it. It is true we can very well remember that at some previous time we enjoyed a particular aesthetic emotion and we can have an aesthetic emotion awakened in us by this memory, but, still, the particular emotion lived through in the past cannot be said to be remembered for it is non-conceptual in its nature. It is [^]~~it is~~ [^]~~this~~ characteristic of the aesthetic emotion that leads to the next declaration viz :- that it is a "Utarina brother" to or exactly like the enjoyment of the taste of Brahman or the Supreme Being. The taste or Anubhūti of Brahman is similarly not cognisable as a conceptual state; yet it has the same

status of an immediate experience.

The transcendental nature of the aesthetic emotion is next touched on. This makes it different from all ordinary emotions. Unlike ordinary emotions, the aesthetic emotion always results in a tone that is enjoyed. We see that in ordinary life a man is reluctant to suffer any painful emotions, yet, when the same emotions play the role of subsidiary emotions to a dominant aesthetic emotion, they are enjoyed and even courted, though their painful nature still subsists. All pain is, as it were, by a transcendent mode, transmuted into pleasure. The representation of pain and sufferings in poems or on the stage is never repellent. It is very often sought and poetic enjoyment, and not torture and suffering of the mind, results from such representation.

Aesthetic emotions, it is next averred, are very select in their nature, and are enjoyed by the chosen few. It is assumed and perhaps with a good deal of truth in it that there is a fundamental difference between man and man in respect of aesthetic gifts and this difference can hardly be made up by any abundance of other types of intelligence or of acquired learning. The true enjoyment of an aesthetic emotion, by its very nature, is reserved for the fortunate few who are born with aesthetic sensibility and whose native aptitude has not been dulled, as Abhinava Gupta remarks it is in the case of the grammarians, the Mīmāṃsakas, the students of the Vedas and those who are disgusted with the world.

The enjoyment of an aesthetic emotion that is, its apprehension takes place very much in the same way as other emotions are apprehended, though it has been pointed out that in other respects an aesthetic emotion differs from any other emotion. When we participate in an aesthetic emotion we feel as if the subsidiary emotions that are concurrent with it were really our own. When we read a drama or see it represented, we fully know that the incidents represented or the emotions displayed do not belong to us, yet all the while we participate in them as if they were our own. Thus the apprehension of an aesthetic emotion does not differ in any way from the apprehension of other emotions.

The above is a brief outline of the dogma of Rasa. We have traced its growth from the very germ found in Bharata and indicated the various orientations it has gone through regarding the philosophical basis of its apprehension, till it has been given a stable form and almost general acceptance by Abhinava Gupta and has been raised to the dignity of the Hindu theory of aesthetic emotion in the memorable work of Visva Natha Kavi Raja. The subject is so vast and of such importance that in compressing it into the limit of a few pages we have our doubts whether an adequate impression of the theory has been conveyed. An elaborate treatment in which the subject justly demands is beyond our scope. At the same time, without any reference to it, any consideration of Hindu critical thought in regard to literature-- literature would be empty and barren.

Moreover, the very fundamentals of the Hindu conception of the drama involve a recognition of Rasa- the drama must be "Rasāsreyam"- must be based on the poetic sentiments.

It might now be asked whether in appraising Shakespeare's works the Rasa theory had ever been applied in India. Before we answer this question we should note here that the theory as it is set forth above in all its details of permanent moods, excitants, ennuants and accessories is very seldom followed, in the modern critical literature of India, and is hardly, if ever, applied in all its complex form in the critical judgment of Indian literature at the present day; much less is it applied in its classical purity to the judgment of foreign works. Still, the standard of Rasa in its quint-essence dominates all critical valuations of literature. It is never forgotten that the true function of a literary work is to produce the relish of a poetic or aesthetic sentiment or sentiments. The nine permanent conditions of the mind, love, mirth, grief, anger, energy, fear, disgust, wonder, quiescence are the ultimate ground basis of a poetic or dramatic work and are the proper themes of literary compositions. The business of the literary artist is to work on these themes and to raise them to a relishable condition i.e. to a condition of being aesthetically enjoyed thus raising them to the status of poetic or aesthetic sentiments. Then these psychic states are no longer merely so, but are Rasas. The presence of the nine Rasas corresponding to the above nine permanent moods of the mind viz., the erotic, the comic, the pathetic, the

furious, the heroic, the terrible, the odious, the marvellous, the quietistic, singly or in combination constitutes literary excellence. The Rasa theory in the above simplified form colours all critical judgments in India and Shakespeare has to submit himself to this standard of taste. And it may be said that though the Hindu standard may not be an absolute one, it is a fairly competent measure of artistic and literary worth. It is needless to say that the Rasa theory thus simplified and freed from embarrassing details will apply to all true literatures and that when applied to Shakespeare he more than meets all its demands. Shakespeare uses for his dramatic purpose all the sentiments of the heart, all the moods of the mind and his works undoubtedly awaken in the heart a most transcendental æsthetic emotion that is unique in its relish and expression and that can only compare with the delight derivable from an ecstatic contemplation of the godhead.

One instance of conscious and deliberate application of the Rasa theory to Shakespeare may be cited here to prove beyond any doubt that our contention that Shakespearian judgment in India is coloured by it is not a fanciful statement. It will appear very curious that the Rasa theory has been re-quisioned by a translator of Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet" to defend tragic plays against the Hindu tradition that forbids the writing of such plays. The author is a Marathi gentleman named K.B. Balseera and the translation of "Romeo and Juliet" in the preface of which he enters the lists is known as "Premāchē valase".

It is [^]very industrious and conscientious production of which we shall have occasions to speak more later.

In the very valuable preface which he writes to this translation, among other things he feels called upon to discuss the propriety of tragic drama as these dramas are forbidden by Hindu writers on dramaturgy and may not be appreciated at their true worth until their merits are fully disclosed. Another weighty reason that forces him to this course of defence & is the travesty of Shakespeares done by some Marathi translators in changing, in the course of rendering them some tragic plays - *Soka Paryavasāyī nāṭakas* - into plays with happy conclusions - *Ānanda paryavasāyī Nāṭakas* - evidently out of deference to the Indian classical convention and regard and tenderness for the orthodox Indian taste. Mr. Pelsara is simply horrified at this latter display of profanity and raises a strong & voice of protest. It is rather curious to note the line of ~~def~~ defence that he very valiantly ~~th~~ takes.

He takes his stand ultimately on the theory of Rase, and justifies tragic dramas as giving in one direction the highest fulfilment to the Rase theory. He refers to the Indian grammarians' dictum that drama is a branch of poetry and he significantly quotes Visvanatha's celebrated "Rasa-makam-uckyam kavyam" to show where in consist the chief merits of poetry. All poetry is ultimately judged by the power it possesses to awaken one or more of the Rases. Dramatic judgment and criticism should therefore seek for the merit and propriety of any kind of drama in its capacity to awaken

this Rasa. Is not "Karuṇa Rasa" or the poetic sentiment of pathos one of the principal Rasas? There is no rule which forbids the employment of Karuṇa Rasa in Kāvya. Now which is the better way to produce Karuṇa Rasa- by representing visibly, as is done in tragic plays, on the stage, $\frac{2}{2}$ death, violence, bloodshed etc or by making indirect verbal reference to them as enjoined by the dramatic rules of the Hindus? Mr. Balzore undoubtedly thinks the first to be the better way of ~~ed~~ achieving the pathetic flavour and the restrictions put in this regard on the freedom of Hindu playwrights seem to him uncalled for and against the very spirit of the Rasa theory- the very pivot of Hindu dramatics and poetics. Apart from this question of the Hindu theorists, he tries to find out whether in common sense there could be anything in favour of such an artificial restriction. It is argued, he says, that the representation of such horrors as death, bloodshed etc, on the stage is likely to give a shock to the soft hearted among the spectators. But is that, he asks, any reason for giving up one of the most effective instruments for producing Karuṇa Rasa? There might be an objection to the display of Ādiresa i.e. love on the stage preferred by the old among the audience. Love is a sentiment hardly relished by them and concession to their taste would be no adequate reason for banishing it from the stage. Drama represents the world and tragic incidents are as much a part of the natural order of things as happy incidents. The purpose of "Rasa Nispatti" - he quotes Bharata's

language- in respect of one principal Rasa viz:- the pathetic, is best served by the visible representation of tragic incidents on the stage .

He refers to the employment of the pathetic sentiment by Sanskrit dramatists and naturally mentions Bhavabhūti who is famous for his masterly delineation of it in "Uttara-Ramacarita" He quotes the familiar and appreciative saying about this drama - "Karuṇakarunivāryyāccariteḥ / Apī grāvā rodī-tyepī-
dalati vajrasya hrdayam" and tries to prove that the sentiment is not foreign to Sanskrit literature, nor is it unappreciated. He also quotes the familiar verses of appreciative reference to Kālidāsa's "Śakuntalā" "Kōpyesu nāṭakam
namyam tatropīca Śakuntalā / Tatropīca caturthōpīka-stotra
śloka catustayam", etc.-- which makes out that the 4 slokas filled with pathetic & sentiment in the fourth act of Śakuntalā are the finest/in the whole range of literature. The sentiment of pathos occupies, he argues from the above quotations, a very high place in Indian dramatic literature.

But how is this "Rasotpatti" or the production of this particular Rasa secured in Indian dramas? Only by verbal references "Svadevavare" to use his phrase- to pathetic incidents and not by any visible representations of them. Hereabout he launches into a comparison between these Sanskrit dramas and the tragic plays of Europe and he comes to the conclusion that the effect achieved in Sanskrit dramas of this type is decidedly feeble in contrast with the effect secured in European tragic plays in which the tragic emotion is sought to be produced by means of ocular representation of calamitous happenings. And he clinches his argument by saying that

if the production of a Rasa be the main function of poetry and drama, the "Utkarsa" of the Rasa i.e. its excellence, its highest or supreme attainment should determine the worth of a production. This being granted, as far as the pathetic Rasa goes, it is best developed in European tragedies, and their superiority in this respect over Sanskrit plays can hardly be questioned.

It will be seen from the above that in applying the Rasa theory to the determination of the literary merits of tragedies Mr. Balsecre ignores its perplexing details of excitants, ensuants and accessory feelings and takes it in its broadest feature. It is in this aspect that the theory still holds its sway in the critical vocabulary as well as critical theories of the different vernacular literatures of modern India. It is in this shape that the theory comes to be applied in the judgment of foreign works.

The above is not an isolated instance of the application of this theory in its simplicity to the judgment of Shakespeare's literary worth. In the preface to his version of the stories of Shakespeare's plays in narrative prose, Haranachandra Raksita makes the following observations on Shakespeare's literary excellence. A free rendering of the passage is given :- "The great poet is every where successful in the creation of Rasas. Whenever he has felt the need of the creation of a Rasa- whether it be heroic, or furious, or pathetic, or comic, or terrible, or disgusting, or odious, or marvellous, or quietistic, or erotic- it looks as if his pen will create any out of these nine at his will.

It is the fruit of superhuman power and preparation to be able to create Rasa in such a full measure". After this remark, he mentions some other elements of his greatness such as his wonderful insight into human character and masterly delineation of it. Then he goes on :- "In all the dramas of this great poet, the highest excellence of the pathetic sentiment is noticed. This is the mark of great poetry. The whole of the Ramayana or the Mahabharata is packed with this particular sentiment from beginning to end".

Instances of a like nature are often to be met with in Shakespearean translations and adaptations. In a Marathi adaptation of Cymbeline named Teru Nataka (1879) by V. . M. Mahajani, the author in the preface devotes a paragraph to the consideration of the predominant and subordinate poetic sentiments in that play. The principal Rasa or poetic sentiment, according to him, is Karuna or pathetic and the subsidiary one is love or Srngara in one of its special varieties i.e. Vipralambha or love is separation. There are touches of the heroic and the comic as well. He introduces this topic in course of determining the merits of the play and winds up this discussion by pointing out the moral significance of this particular drama and dramas in general. Thus it will be seen that India's critical judgment on literary productions is imperfect without a reference to this dominant theory. Similarly Hemchandra, a great Bengali poet, in his first translation (he calls it an imitation but it is really

a translation with certain inevitable modifications) of Shakespeare viz "Romeo and Juliet" (1895) - one of the very few successful renderings of Shakespeare in India - writes a valuable preface to justify his departure from Shakespeare here and there in obedience to demands made on him by the different genius of his language and by the divergent manners and customs, outlook on life and things etc. of his country. He concludes by saying that notwithstanding these modifications introduced, he has retained the principal poetical ^{or} aesthetic flavour of the original play and no violence has been ~~ma-~~ done to it. No more illustrations of the importance of this dogma of Rasa and its application in India's critical appreciation and judgment of Shakespeare will perhaps be needed.

The Rasa theory, its implication, its importance in the critical literature of the ancient Hindus, its present-day status and significance have now been sufficiently made clear for our purpose. One important feature of it, however, remains to be noticed ~~42-~~ and it is a feature which is of comparatively modern growth and is fraught with great influence. It will be remembered that nine principal Rasas corresponding to the nine sentiments are recognised as the proper themes of poetry and drama in Sanskrit. But, of all the Rasas, Śṛṅgāra or love has in course of time come to form the chief absorbing interest of Sanskrit poetry and drama. As a consequence of this prominence acquired by love, we have in later rhetorical literature a series of erotico-rhetorical treatises such as Rudrabhettā.

"Srngara -tilaka", Bhoja's "Srngara - Prakasa", to name only two well-known works from a fairly good number. This fact is of special interest to us; for when we shall study the translations and adaptations of Shakespeare's works in India, we shall find that in selecting the plays for purposes of rendering - for all his plays have not been rendered - the authors have been unconsciously influenced among other things by this obsession which makes love the fundamental Rasa in poetry. This undue pre-occupation with the Srngara Rasa is to be noticed in the elaborate definitions, distinctions, classifications, of the amorous sentiment with descriptions of its all and sundry / varying emotional moods and situations in which these treatises simply revel. It is also due to this that such / elaborate divisions and subdivisions of the hero and the heroine and their adjuncts are indulged in.

The three fundamental elements in the Hindu conception of the drama are, as we have seen, the subject matter the hero and the Rasa. The very basis of the somewhat elaborate classification of dramas is laid here. As Dhnanajay puts it "Vastu ne-tā rasas-tesām bhedaḥ" (Dhanurupa B. I. page 6, edited by G.C.O. Haas) - the subject matter the hero and the Rasa differentiate the ten kinds, one from another. The subject matter according to the canon regarding it, is of three kinds - (a) prakāśta or celebrated being drawn from the legends of the past; (b) Utpādya i.e. invented by the poet; (c) Mīra i.e. mixed being a combination of the first two. Nearly the whole of the second book of Dhanurupa is devoted to the

description and classification of the characteristics of the hero. The four types with their characteristic qualities ~~in-~~ into which the drama—tic hero is classified are meticulously described. His companions and his opponents come in for their share of in-cidental attention. The heroine is also introduced as an inseparable concomitant of the hero and is classified and described in her different characteristics and *twenty* natural graces. Her messengers are not forgotten.

It is useless to look for anything that is essential to the organic processes of the dramatic art in the above laws. They are artificial drama/tic laws framed for a particular type of drama and hence they will not aid us in properly appreciating and valuing dramatic works not conformable to these false standards. It is therefore that we refrain from pursuing this portion of the Hindu dramatics any further. It was, however, a different matter with the Rasa or the poetic sentiment in which the very essence of poetic enjoyment is said to consist. It is true that dramas ~~are~~ are classified into different kinds according to the principal part allotted to this or that Rasa but this classification is as arbitrary as the classification of subject matter, hero and heroine. While such classification is rejected as false and arbitrary, the psychological truth underlying the theory of Rasa seems to us as capable of universal application in accounting for that aesthetic enjoyment that we derive from the reading of a poem or the acting of a drama.

Our attempt so far has been to capture and state, as briefly and as clearly as could be done, those elements in Indian conception of the drama, that are either immutable laws of the dramatic art and therefore of unrestricted application or are such individual traits as are also to be found in the romantic drama of England. The laws so far evolved in the world for the guidance of the dramatic art have been very few and the Hindu dramatic theory cannot put forward any extraordinary claim in this respect. Laws there are in Hindu dramaturgy by hundreds and they are also of the most rigid and punctilious kind but after all they are merely concerned with the temporary phases of the special type that the Hindus evolved. They are by no means universal laws essential to the very being of the dramatic art. It has been the constant endeavour of literary criticism throughout the world to discover the means which the drama should employ for the purpose of its artistic ends and the multitude of technical terms and formulae which have in consequence gathered round the practice of this elusive art hardly exhaust the need and more often than not circumscribe the art whose free expressions they are designed to serve. The effort of the Hindu literary criticism has similarly lost itself in the quicksand of artificial and arbitrary prescriptions.

In spite of the fact that the dramatic art is one of the most living and the most Protean of arts and that its laws are as varied as its character is and that they are not easy to discover, are there not some

fundamental laws of the art that are discoverable in the great masterpieces, that repeat themselves in the dramatic productions of all ages and are not merely the idols of an age or period? One such fundamental law concerns itself with the main function of the drama ~~and~~ which is the imitation of action. The drama requires an action complete in itself with cause and effect, which is technically called a plot, and the construction of the plot has to be based on the ~~law~~ of the completeness of action. This is one of the fundamental laws that must be recognised by all dramas and an imperfect understanding of the law of completeness led to that false law of unity of action set up by the classical drama of Europe.

There is no ~~set~~ doubt that the law of ^{the} completeness of action is obeyed in Indian dramas; otherwise they would have been utterly imperfect productions from the very nature of ~~the~~ things. That every drama should represent in organic sequence the several stages of which a complete action consists and which are essential to such action is in practice followed by Indian dramatists. That this restriction imposed by the very nature of the dramatic art does not imply the employment of only one event in the drama, as the stultifying provision of the ~~the~~ unity of action in the classical standard of Europe enjoins, is also recognised by ancient Indian playwrights. We have thoroughly discussed this subject in a previous chapter. It now remains to be seen whether in critical literature pertaining to the

drama there is a conscious and sufficient recognition of this fundamental law of the dramatic art.

A dramatic action, if conceived of as complete, has five natural stages, which are its causes, growth, height, consequences and close. These five stages are fully recognised by the Hindu dramatic theory and they are technically known as "Ārambha" (beginning), Yatna (effort), Prāptiśānta (prospect of success), Nigatānti (certainty of success), and Phalāyoga (attainment of the result or realisation of the final issue). [c.f. *Āvasthāh pāñca karyasya prarabdhasya phalārthibhiḥ/Ārambhakatuprāptyaśānti nigatānti phalāyogamāḥ*. *Desarga*, verse 28, G.C.O. Haas's edition page 2.].

The orthodox division of a drama into five acts as understood by European dramatists rests on the natural division of a complete dramatic action into the above five stages. The five acts are designed to correspond to the five stages of the action and represent a technical order like the following :- The first act represents the opening of movement, the second represents its growth and leads on to its height or climax in the third which, in its turn, leads on to its fall /or resolution in the fourth act. Hence-forward the action gradually dies off till in the fifth its close or more technically its denouement is achieved. As has been seen, the Hindus have a perfect conception of these five stages of a complete dramatic action but the acts in a Hindu classical drama are never intended to

correspond to these five stages. Hence it is that the Hindu theorists allow more than five acts to a drama. According to them the acts should range between five and ten (cf. *Sahitya Darpana*, Ch VI, Sloka 277, Edited by J.R. Ballantyne & ^{mītra} Das). How are we to explain this? The explanation is that with the Hindu dramatist the acts are not the structural divisions of a drama. These divisions are not—~~the structural divisions~~—called in Indian critical terminology *Sandhis* or links or junctures and every drama must have ~~them~~—them whether in correspondence with the acts or apart from them. These five junctures are technically named (1) *Mukha*, or the opening; (2) *Pratimukha* or the progression; (3) *Gorbha* or the development; (4) *Avamarśa* or the pause; (5) *Upasamṛti*, also called *Nirvachana* i.e. the conclusion in which all the aforesaid parts converge towards one and in the final catastrophe. (cf. *Dasarupa - Nāṭya's Edition*—page 11. *Mukha* *pratimukha* *gorbhā* *āvamarśa* *ūpasamṛtiḥ*; also *Bhārata*, Ch 19, slokas 24 and 35.)

We can illustrate the above from a well known play *Malati Madhava* which has ten acts. The five links or junctures in it /are distributed as follows :- The *Mukha* or the opening—of movement comprises the events of the first two acts viz; the first sight of *Malatī*, the incidents of the *Bakula*-wrath and *Madhava*'s portrait drawn by *Malati*, the love pangs of *Madhava* and *Malati*, and the cunning speeches of *Kūmandakī* designed to increase the ardour of *Malati*'s love for *Madhava*. The *Pratimukha* or progression takes up the next two acts and the incidents covered by it are *Madhava*'s desire to see

Malati caused by his love for her and fanned by the contrivances of Kamandaki and her disciple Avalokita, complications caused by the message of the proposed match between Malati and Nanda and despair of the two lovers thereon. The Garbhā or development spreads over the fifth, sixth and seventh acts. The plot attains further development both from encouragement and resistance. The chief events are the happenings in the cremation ground, at the temple of Keralā, the fall of Aghora Ghanta under the sword of Madhava, the wedding of the supposed Malati and Nanda, the clandestine marriage of Malati and Madhava and the elopement of Makeranda and Madayantika. The next two acts represent the Avasthā or pause. Impediments to happy union still dog the footsteps of the lovers. Makeranda quarrels with the city guards, falls upon them and fights with them and is aided by his friend Madhava. Malati is abducted by Kapaḷkundalā and despair fills the hearts of Madhava and Makeranda, but the opportune appearance of Saudamini begins the resolution. The Nirvāhā or conclusion occupies one act only and the last one. All the events converge to one and the same goal viz: the union of the two pairs of lovers, Malati and Madhava, Madayantika and Makeranda. The King's consent to their marriage is yielded and Nanda approves of the unions.

According to the Hindu theorists the plot or story itself has five elements. They are called "Artaprekṣitī" or the leading sources of the accomplishment of the grand object in a drama.

Bījebindupe tākākhya prakarīkāryalakṣaṇāḥ

Arthaprakṛtyaḥ pañca tā etāḥ parikīrtitāḥ.

(*Dasarupa* -Hess-sloka 27; - F. Hall, sloka 17).

These five elements are (1) *Bīja* or the seed or the germ which is the source of the principal object in a drama, a means for the accomplishment of the final aim; it is at first manifested as very small, later develop- developing in various ways like a seed developing into a tree. (2) *Bindu* is the source of an intermediate object; it is the sudden development of a secondary incident and supplies an important element in the development of the plot; it causes a break in the continuity of the plot caused by the introduction of extraneous matters. (3) *Patāka* and (4) *Prakāṣa* are episodic incidents; (5) *Kārya* is the denouement.

Before the conclusion of this chapter a reference to the contents of *Dasarupa*, the most popular treatise on the art of dramatic composition at the present time, seems to be necessary. The work consists of four books and a simple enumeration of their subject matter will show how minute and elaborate are the rules that were devised by Indian critics for the guidance of the dramatist. The first book of this well known work contains fundamental definitions of drama, of pantomime and dancing as its accessories, and statements regarding the basis of classification of dramas, the subdivisions of subject matter, elements of the plot, the five stages of action, the five junctures, the opening and its subdivisions, the progression and its subdivisions, the development and its

subdivisions, the pause and its subdivisions, the conclusion and its subdivisions, the two-fold way of treating the subject matter, the five kinds of intermediate scenes, definition of asides, confidential remarks etc. The second book deals with the characteristics of the hero, the four types of the hero, the hero as lover, companions of the hero, the three kinds of heroine- the hero's wife, a maiden or another's wife, a courtesan, classification of heroines according to their relation with the hero, messengers of the heroines, the twenty natural graces of the heroine, assistants of the hero when a king, grouping of characters according to rank, the different styles of procedure, gay, grandiose, horrific and other styles, their employment, local characteristics of a drama, language of the various characters, mode and address etc. The third book is devoted to the consideration of the different varieties of drama, its internal arrangement. It treats of the Nohoka as the typical variety of drama, the commencement of play, the eloquent style, the introduction and its various forms, use of the introductory elements, selection of the principal subject, adaptation of the story, arrangement of the dramatic structure, appropriate arrangement of the beginning, characteristics of an act, sentiments and their uses, actions not allowed on the stage, the contents of ^{an} act, the number of acts in the Nohoka. This book concludes with descriptions and definitions of Prakarana, Bhāṣa, Prahasana, Dima, Vyāyoga, Sansa-kāra, Tīlāi, Aṅka, and Jhāṅga- the nine varieties of drama beside the Nohoka. The fourth book is mainly concerned

with the *Rasa* or the relish or flavour of the poetic sentiments. It describes the production of flavour, its excipients and adjuncts, defines a state, involuntary expressions of emotions, accessory emotions, thirty-three in number, the permanent emotions, the fourfold character of the sentiments, and *Rasa* itself. The erotic flavour with all its varieties—privation and its different stages, separation and its varieties, union and its characteristics,—the heroic, the odious, the ~~great~~ furious, the comic, the marvellous, the terrible and the pathetic flavours ^{all} receive individual treatment. The importance of this fourth book of *Y. Dascrigo* has been shown in our discussion of the *Rasa* theory. The degree of *Rasa* forms, as it were, the very staple of India's literary judgment. Originally evolved as a standard of dramatic criticism, as has already been shown, it has later been adopted and incorporated into the poetics and it now forms one indispensable canon for all literary evaluation.

Our survey of Sanskrit critical treatises on drama and poetry is now complete. It has been ~~very~~ rapid survey considering the vast field that has to be covered, but the scope of our subject will not permit of any elaborate excursion into this fascinating topic. The study was mainly undertaken to find out and assess what mental equipment India possesses for dramatic studies generally and especially for an appreciative study of Shakespearian masterpieces. We have therefore always endeavoured to choose from among a huge multitude of artificial rules and false standards those canons only that seemed to embody truths regarding the dramatic art in general, and we have always tried to

emphasise them. The Hindu dramatic theory appears to have thought out one or two of these laws regarding dramatic construction that have so far been laid hold of by the world. Over and above this, it seems to us to be peculiarly rich in its theory of aesthetic enjoyment, the production and nature of the aesthetic emotion that is at the root of the delight we derive from literature. All these laws are of universal application, and the access to any good drama or poetry of any country will be easily gained through them. We have ignored and perhaps with good reason all these interfering laws and dicta that produced the ideal classical drama of India in all its peculiar features.

Yet, rather detailed references to the subject matter of the two well-known critiques on drama "Bharata-Natya Sashtra" and "Dasarupa" have been made and the relevance of this might be questioned. This has been done with two objects in view. First, the importance attached to dramas in Hindu achievements will be clear from this and the traditions which have been left by them and in which Indians of the present day live will explain the aptitude and keenness of the Indian mind for Shakespearian studies. Secondly, it will be remembered we have strongly protested against the rather light-hearted theory of the Greek origin of the Indian drama. Some of these quixotic adventurers have tried to read into "Bharata-Natya-Sashtra" and "Dasarupa" "Aristotle". A mere glance at the contents of these two works will convince any sane man of the levity of these scholars.

Part 11.

Fruits of Shokasperien studies.

Part II

Chapter I.

The nature and fruits of Shakespearian studies and appreciation in India: adaptations and translations in the several vernacular languages considered in their chronological and other aspects.

It is a truism to say that the best study and appreciation of an author lies through acquaintance with his works in the original. But such a course on a wide scale cannot be practised. The diversities of languages in the world are serious impediments which can very seldom be overcome. The fate of the artist in words, in this respect, seems to be a particularly hard one. He has not a direct appeal to the heart of the mankind as his colleague in colours or melodies more or less has. The "curse of Babel" is nowhere more painfully effective than in the case of a great writer aspiring to be understood by the whole of his kind. Unless he is to remain pent up within his own country and content with a limited audience composed of his own countrymen and such other people as might happen to speak the same tongue, he, in order to reach a wider public, must submit himself to a process, however imperfect it might be, of translation. This is in modern times, the recognised approach to a foreign author and its practice is being daily more and more widened. However inferior it may be to the first-hand knowledge of an author, it is through translation that now-a-days he comes to be read, appreciated and even loved in a foreign land.

All authors of world-wide reputation have gone

through this process. Perhaps in nine cases out of ten the author in the original has horribly suffered mutilations and disfigurements of various kinds, and has, after all, been inadequately rendered and conveyed. Yet, it has been the only way in which a wider public could be reached and wide recognition and reputation could be built up for them. Shakespeare's fame owes not a little to such foreign translations, and if translators have much to be forgiven, it should not be forgotten that on their sacrificed selves are the reputations of world-authors raised and planted secure.

Among the foreign countries where Shakespeare enjoys a vogue India alone presents a very unique feature. Outside the English speaking world, nowhere else the great dramatist is so much read in the original and appreciated and loved from direct first hand knowledge. It is due, no doubt, to India's political connection with England and the system of education that obtains there and the place and importance that English language and literature occupy in that system. But it would be a mistake to hold that the political sword has been a path for Shakespeare to India's heart. But for England's political ascendancy in India, it can be readily admitted, Shakespeare might have perhaps remained little known or wholly unknown to India. The first introduction to India Shakespeare no doubt owes to intervention of politics, but having been thus introduced he has made his own conquests and annexed his own kingdom in the love and esteem of Indians. How this has taken place we tried to

to make clear in our previous discussion.

It is interesting to know how extensive this direct knowledge of Shakespeare is. Some idea about this will be formed when it is known that in India at the present day education in popular view is synonymous with a knowledge of English which involves considerable acquaintance with English literature. All higher education in India is carried through the medium of English and English literature forms a very important, if not the most important, part in school and university curricula. The masters of English literature are studied from school upwards and they hold a very high place in the love and reverence of an educated Indian.

The consequence is that an educated Indian at the finish of his scholastic career, whatever may be his real aptitude for it, has sufficient knowledge of English authors, and if he wants to keep - up the acquaintance generally and improve upon it, or if he gets specially interested in a particular author, he naturally goes to the original. Thus Shakespeare for whom any one knowing the English language and literature would feel the greatest attraction, is widely read in the original and the appreciation that results from such original study is very much like what he meets with in his own country and elsewhere where his countrymen are settled.

It may be asked - "How does this admiration for Shakespeare's masterpieces ^{born} ~~form~~ of direct knowledge express itself? In what practical results does it issue? The question is a different one - difficult one to answer and a satisfactory

answer depends very much on what we mean by such practical and tangible results. If eulogistic reference-s to the dramatist and his works, his supreme genius be such, plentiful evidences will be forthcoming from periodicals and similar kinds of literature. This admiration of India for the towering genius of Shakespeare is very finely and truly voiced in that memorable Book of Homage prepared by the distinguished Shakesperian scholar Sir, Israel Gollancz by three re-presentative Indians of whom Sir Rabindra Nath Tagore is one. Attempts to understand and interpret him by Indians, though they generally take the not very noble shape of school and college editions of his works, are not rare. It is true, India has not yet much to boast of in respect of that kind of Shakesperian scholarship which has for its object the solution of the many dark and yet unexplored problems of his life and writings, but this cannot be attributed to any lack of warmth in India's appreciation - for him and is easily explained by the absence there of opportunities and materials of such nature.

One very prominent result of this firsthand knowledge is the attempt which is very often made to relate Shakespeare's dramas to classical Sanskrit productions in order to see their common as well as distinguishing features. Comparative studies are often made of the dramatic skill evinced in these different productions of the two different countries, in the delineation of character or management of incidents. One classical instance of the latter method of study occurs in Rabindra Nath Tagore's literary essays

where Sakuntala and Miranda are very beautifully and discriminatingly compared and contrasted.

This comparatively wide first-hand knowledge of Shakespeare has worked rather injuriously in one direction. After all, English education in India will never spread to the extent when every Indian will have direct access to the treasures of the great dramatist and will thus be in a position to dispense with translations of Shakespeare in the vernaculars. Translations and adaptations of all his dramatic works must be undertaken to diffuse his knowledge among such Indians as will remain ignorant of any other language but their own and the number of such Indians will always exceed the number of those proficient in English. It was so at the time Shakespeare was first introduced into India, it is so to-day after nearly one hundred years of English education and it will be so for all future time. But so far this fact has been ignored and though of all foreign countries India's direct knowledge of Shakespeare is undoubtedly the widest it remains a curious thing that in none of the Indian vernaculars a complete translation of all his dramas yet exists. The reason for this is not far to seek. It is the apathy of English educated Indians towards such productions, that has prevented them from flourishing. The point will be made clearer below as we go on.

1. Narrative prose versions of the stories of his plays are left out of account here. Even of such versions, there is only one in the whole of India and that happens to be in Bengal.

The admirers of Shakespeare's dramatic genius, however, have not been completely discouraged from attempts of the above kind. They have tried amidst many disheartening and opposing circumstances to make him intelligible to those who lack the good fortune of an English education, and who, in number, always preponderate over the rest. Their efforts in this direction have issued in the various adaptations and translations that we now possess in the different vernaculars of India.

The first difficulty that confronted this heroic band of pioneers was the undeveloped form of almost all the Indian languages at the time the attempt to render Shakespeare in the Indian tongues was inaugurated. Bengal led the way in the matter and the first endeavour to convey Shakespeare in any form was made there in 1848. It was not possible to call in the aid of Sanskrit which was once the literary language of the whole of India and was no longer so. Even if it were not a fact, Shakespeare in Sanskrit would be as much a sealed book for the generality of the people as Shakespeare in his original English, for its knowledge at any time was by no means wide. It is true most of these vernaculars had a literature of a kind dating, for instance, in the case of Bengali, from prehistoric times (Cf. Sir Grierson's remarks in his *Linguistic Survey of India*) and in some cases, as in the case of Bengali again (Cf. Sir Grierson's remarks on the song of *Mānik-chandra* in Bengali), the earliest record dates from the days of the Buddhists. Well-known names of authors in these vernacular tongues and their works stand out ranging between

the 13th century A. D. and the 18th century A.D. i.e. till the time of the British occupation of the country. But the range of these vernacular literatures as they existed at the time of the advent of the British in India was very much r-estricted. They all owed their revival at different times to the religious renaissances that began from the time of Senkara and went on for several centuries and thus they are mostly religious literatures. The religious reformers and leaders found it desirable to make accessible to those who knew no other language but their own vernacular the religious thoughts and ideas contained in Sanskrit treatises. Hence, in most cases, we find that these literatures mainly consist of versified translations of Sanskrit religious works. It is also to be noticed that nearly all of them at the time had no prose literature.

The difficulty above stated was in all conscience a stupendous one. They had not an adequate instrument of language ready to hand to utilise in the ambitious task of translating Shakespeare and in most cases they had to mould the instrument itself. As has been mentioned above the vernacular literatures which they had inherited were of the narrowest range and drama was unrepresented in them. Of course, Sanskrit possessed a fine body of dramatic literature but they were not translated even in the Sanskritic vernaculars. The difficulty which these pioneers had to encounter and overcome in this respect will be brought home to the mind from the following observations made on an adaptation of "Othello" in Tamil brought out by Mr P.S. Purāissamī

Iyengar has recently as in 1911. The dramatic critic of the Indian stage (a monthly published by the Suguna Vilase Sabha, Madras, Vol .1. No. 1911) remarks about this production:- " By this adaptation Mr. Iyengar has not only made a valuable contribution to the dramatic literature in the language of this part of the country, but has also done a great service to the general public, especially that section of it unacquainted with English or knowing it too little to understand the complexity and mystery of the great play or fullness and force of the powers of the world's greatest dramatist. The difficulties of the translation are indeed immense and the art consists in rendering the original with not only accuracy but beauty. In doing so, one has to keep in view the totality of the effect aimed at in the original which is often the trick of the language used or the combination of the words employed, and hence all the more difficult to translate. We congratulate the author on having achieved in some measure this ideal Next to "Hamlet". perhaps "Othello" lends itself least either for translation or adaptation in Tamil- a language not over rich in its vocabulary for description of complex mental conditions and feelings or fine shades of character."

The significant admission which the above critic makes in 1911 about the capacity of Tamil to give versions of Shakespeare's plays can be unhesitatingly applied to all the Indian vernaculars about the year 1848 when the first attempt was made in the direction of rendering Shakespeare in the an Indian vernacular.

Another impediment of an equally serious character

has been the apathy or very often something stronger, a positive dislike, towards such productions evinced by educated Indians. It is true that modern vernacular literatures of India— and some of them are very copious and in a state of great development— owe their existence entirely to the exertions of English—educated Indians but the trend of their efforts to cultivate and enrich their mother-tongues has been mainly to stimulate original productions, may be, in imitation of the various forms of English literature and to eschew as much as they could translations of the literary masterpieces of England. As far as their own profit and pleasure are concerned, they would prefer to derive these from the originals and would never go to the translations. As far as their less fortunate brethren who know little or no English are concerned, perhaps they look forward to a time when the spread of education would break down the barrier that keeps them from the enjoyment of these masterpieces. In any case, they do not like to offer poor substitutes in translations for the original and think that starvation is better than feeding on husks. The above may or may not be an adequate explanation of the mental attitude of the majority of educated Indians in regard to translations of Shakespeare's plays. What we are primarily concerned with is the fact itself and the fact has an immense bearing on the history of such translations and adaptations of Shakespeare's works as we possess today. After all, the educated class in any country are arbiters in matters of literary and artistic tastes and standards and when they show indifference to any particular type of

literary or artistic activities, it is bound to languish in the cold shade of neglect.

An analysis of the various translations and adaptations of Shakespeare's works in the several Indian tongues reveals the following facts. Out of the 37 plays attributed to Shakespeare only 25 have been so far translated or adapted in India. These translations and adaptations spread over 10 different Indian languages, 7 of these languages belonging to the Indo-Aryan family and three to the Dravidian family.

The 25 plays so far handled by Indian authors are the "Tempest"- "The Two Gentlemen of Verona"- "The Merry wives of Windsor"- "Measure for Measure"- "The comedy of Errors"- "Much ado about nothing"- "Love's Labour's Lost"- "A Midsummer Night's Dream"- "The Merchant of Venice"- "As you Like It"- "The Taming of the Shrew"- "All's Well That Ends Well"- "Twelfth Night"- "The Winter's Tale"- "The Tragedy of King Richard III"- "The Famous History of the Life of King Henry VIII.- "Romeo and Juliet"- "Julius Caesar"- "Macbeth"- "Hamlet"- "King Lear"- "Othello"- "Antony and Cleopatra"- "Cymbeline"- "Pericles".

It will be seen that in the above list only two historical plays dealing with the events of English history are included and the rest are left out. Among other plays "Troilus and Cressida", "Coriolanus"- "Titus Andronicus" and "Timon of Athens" have failed to catch the imagination of the Indian authors. We shall endeavour to give

reasons for this selection as well as omissions.

It must not be thought that the above plays have all been translated or adapted in each of the ten Indian languages spoken of. It will be interesting to notice their distribution among these different languages. Marathi heads the list in point of number, having to its credit translations and adaptations of 19 Shakespearian plays. They are ^{"The Tempest"} "The Merry Wives of Windsor" - "Measure for Measure" - "The Comedy of Errors" - "A Midsummer Night's Dream" - "The Merchant of Venice" - "As you Like it" - "The Taming of the Shrew" - "All's Well that Ends Well" - "Twelfth Night" - "The Winter's Tale" - "The Tragedy of King Richard III" - "The Famous History of the Life of King Henry VIII" - "Romeo and Juliet" - "Julius Caesar" - "King Lear" - "Othello" - "Antony and Cleopatra" - "Cymbeline". The six plays that appear in the general list of Indian translations and adaptations and that are left out in Marathi are "The Two Gentlemen of Verona" - "Much ado about nothing" - "Love's Labour Lost" - "Hamlet" - "Macbeth" and "Pericles". Next comes Bengali with its 14 translations and adaptations. Bengali has translations and adaptations of the following Plays :- "The Tempest" - "Measure for Measure" - "The Comedy of Errors" - "A Midsummer Night's Dream" - "The Merchant of Venice" - "As you Like it" - "The Winter's tale" - "Romeo and Juliet", - "Julius Caesar" - "Macbeth" - "Hamlet" - "King Lear" - "Othello" - "Cymbeline". The plays from the above general list, which are not dealt with in Bengali

are the two historical dramas "The Tragedy of King Richard III" and "The Famous History of the Life of King Henry VIII" - and "The Two gentlemen of Verona," "The Merry Wives of Windsor", "Much ado About Nothing", "Love's Labour Lost", "Twelfth Night", "The Taming of the Shrew", "All's well that ends well". and Urdu comes next with 14 translations and adaptations which include "The Tempest" - "The Comedy of Errors" - "Much ado about Nothing" - "Love's Labour Lost" - "A Midsummer Night's Dream" - "The Merchant of Venice" - "As you like it" - "The Winter's Tale" - "The Tragedy of King Richard III." - "Romeo and Juliet" - "Hamlet" - "King Lear" - "Othello" - "Cymbeline". The plays left out are "The Two Gentlemen of Verona" - "The Merry Wives of Windsor" - "Measure for Measure" - "The Taming of the Shrew" - "All's Well that Ends Well" - "Twelfth Night" - "King Henry VIII" - "Julius Caesar" - "Macbeth" - "Antony and Cleopatra" and "Pericles".

In the Dravidian group of languages Tamil, Telegu and Canarese have exactly the same number of translations and adaptations to their credit. The Tamil list comprises the following plays:- "The Two Gentlemen of Verona" - "The Comedy of Errors" - "The Merchant of Venice" - "The Taming of the Shrew" - "Twelfth Night" - "Romeo and Juliet" - "Hamlet" - "Othello". The Telegu list includes "The Tempest" - "The Merchant of Venice" - "As you Like it" - "Macbeth" - "King Lear" - "Othello" - "Cymbeline" - "Pericles". Canarese follows them with the same number of translations and adaptations which include "The two gentlemen of verona" - "The Merchant of Venice" - "All's Well That Ends Well" - "Romeo and Juliet" - "Macbeth" - "King Lear" - "Othello" - "Cymbeline".

Gujrati comes next with seven plays and is followed very close by Hindi with six. The Gujarati translations and adaptations include "Measure for Measure" - "Comedy of Errors" - "The Merchant of Venice" - "All's Well that Ends Well" - "Romeo and Juliet" - "Othello" - "Cymbeline". The Hindi list includes "The Comedy of Errors" - "The Merchant of Venice" - "As you Like it" - "Romeo and Juliet" - "King Lear" and "Othello". Punjabi and Sindhi have each one play to boast of. There is a Punjabi translation of "Othello" and a Sindhi adaptation of "The Merchant of Venice".

The above account represents only translations and adaptations in the dramatic form of Shakespearian plays. The stories of Shakespeare's plays rendered in narrative prose either in imitation of Lamb or independently, or translations of Lamb's Tales as a whole or in particular have been excluded from our enumeration. They occupy no place in the modern dramatic literature of India and as such their study will yield very little interest beyond showing a particular direction in which it has been sought to popularise Shakespeare.

If, however, the translations of Lamb's Tales or independent efforts to give in the form of prose stories in the Indian languages the plays of Shakespeare are taken into account, the relative position of the different vernaculars in the above list will be changed. Bengali, then, would occupy the first place as there is in Bengali a work which is erroneously supposed to be a translation of all the plays of Shakespeare. This production which is by a well

known Bengali author Haren Chandra Rakshit is nothing more than a prose narrative version in Bengali of all the stories in Shakespeare's plays. Mar-athi will then have 20 instead of 19 plays to its credit. Hindustani (i.e. Urdu) will add to its number 2 more works being translations of Lamb's Tales and Hindi will add one such work. Tamil will increase the number to 11, Canerese to 10 and Telugu to 9.

Except in the case of Bengali which is easily the most advanced and progressive among the Indian vernaculars and has the most copious literature, the capacity and the stage of development of the above Indian vernacular literature can, generally speaking, be very well measured from the strength of Shakespeari~~e~~n translations and adaptations in each case as they appear in the above list of distribution. Marathi and Urdu are undoubtedly in a state of greater development than either Hindi or Gujrati, or the Dravidian languages, Tamil, Teleg~~y~~ Telugu and Canerese. The last five languages seem to have arrived at the same degree of advancement. Sindhi and Punjabi are unquestionably lagging behind in the~~m~~erch in comparison with the other languages.

The history of these translations and adaptation chronologically begins, as has been stated in 1848 in Bengal, nearly a century after the political power had passed into the hands of Brit~~is~~ Britain in 1757 with the rout of the Nawab of Bengal. It would be interesting to see this date viz : 1848 in its proper context in the evolution of Indian's English education. Though 1757 is the year that marks the rise of British power above the horizon in India, it was not till 1765 that it obtained its formal recognition.

From that year for nearly five decades the East India Company that ruled the country in the name of the Crown was entirely engrossed in consolidating and extending its power over the country as the old political structure crumbled away before it. It was not till 1813 that the Company and the Board of Directors realised for the first time that a Government had other duties than those of establishing and maintaining peace and order and collecting revenue. The dissolution of the great-Moghul Empire, the internal feuds of the several contending native powers that arose on the ruins of that Empire and their gradual extinction before the more virile foreign aggressor had left the country in a helpless state both morally and materially. An uplift of the people through education was necessary even for good government and a sense of it dawned on the new masters of India's destiny as late as in 1813. It is true indeed that long before in 1781 Warren Hastings had felt the same need and had made an attempt to make some provision in this direction by establishing the Calcutta Madrasah, the first educational institution to be started in India under British rule. In 1791 this had been followed by the establishment of a Sanskrit college in Banarès. But the object of both these institutions was to preserve and impart the traditional indigenous cultures. In 1813, however, the Board of Directors felt that a larger effort in this direction should be made and a modest sum of a lakh of rupees from the Government treasury was sanctioned for educational expenditure. In 1823 a Committee of Public Instruction was brought into being in Bengal to administer this fund and till 1835 the fund thus provided was being spent in setting up and maintaining an agency to impart the same traditional education

of the land.

Private Indian and Missionary enterprises were being launched simultaneously for the education of the people but they took an entirely different line. The inadequacy of purely oriental culture was, from the very outset, patent to these agencies, and it was felt that India's regeneration could alone be wrought by the introduction of a knowledge of Western literature and science. With the avowed object of imparting Western education the famous Serampore College was founded by Missionary efforts in 1818 and the Hindu College was started in 1817 in Calcutta by private Indian and European efforts.

Thus there were two rival camps at the time in the country regarding the kind of education that should be provided in India one camp clamouring that the money allocated by the administration for educational expenditure should go towards the preservation and encouragement of the ancient culture of the land, the other holding quite as stoutly that money so spent was so much waste and that India's regeneration could be secured only by the introduction and propagation of Western literature and science in which the secret of the power of the conquerors seemed to lie. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, one of the greatest sons of India, threw his whole weight on the side of Western culture. The Government was undecided in mind for a long time, though actually the sanctioned amount was being expended on the fostering of the indigenous culture. Then came the memorable year 1835.

It is a momentous year in the history of India's education. Macaulay became appointed that year a member of the aforesaid Committee of Public Instruction that was placed in charge of the

the tentative educational experiments of the Company. He at once took up the burning controversy regarding the merits and suitability for India of occidental and oriental systems of education and by one bold stroke of his terrific pen decided once for all what shape the future education of India should take. In the famous minute written by him he advocated the cause of Western education in his characteristically vigorous manner and in so doing poured unmerited contumely on the rival system and culture. Whatever sin he might have committed through ignorance in this unjust and wholesale castigation of oriental culture, he was undoubtedly right in his insistence on its inadequacy compared with the culture of his own country as it stood well in the middle of the 19th century. He was also supported in his attitude by a considerable volume of responsible Indian opinion of the time and that opinion then represented the forces of progress in India. The cause of English education thus triumphed over what, in its oneness, might be regarded as the forces of reaction and the year may be marked, for all practical purposes, as the year when Shakespeare's formal introduction into India took place. From 1835 to 1848, a period of 13 years, a long enough period of incubation, elapsed before Shakespeare made his first appearance in an oriental garb.

This first fruit of early Shakesperian studies in India is not a thing of great moment. It is a bengali version in narrative prose of the story of "Romeo and Juliet" and is named "Romeo ohen Julieter Monohar Upakhyayan" i.e. the charming story of Romeo and Juliet. Very likely the story was

written in ~~in~~ imitation of the tale by Charles and Mary Lamb but there is no actual evidence for such a conclusion. The real significance of this publication lies in the fact that, having been written by an English educated person, its language and style were revised and polished by two Sanskritist pundits and the venture was thus launched under the blessings of these orthodox custodians of ancient culture. They do not betray the slightest uneasiness regarding Shakespeare's dramas as being in any essential respect antagonistic to the classical type which it would be their obvious duty to defend against the onslaught of any newfangled foreign importation. On the contrary, they hail the event of the rendering of a Shakespearian play as a laudable effort to enrich the vernacular tongue.

The second venture took place in 1852 and it was a Bengali translation of Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare. It is interesting to note in this connection the part which has been played by Lamb's Tales in making Shakespeare known to and popularising him among Indians unable to read and appreciate him in the original. Indeed, it may be said that the way has been laid by Lamb's immortal production for, after all, for all we know, the production of 1848 might have been inspired by the author's acquaintance with these tales. This second book again is the production of an orthodox Pandit, ^{^Muktaram} Vidyavagish, who had a few friends as his collaborators. It will be instructive from many points of view to read the preface to this work. A free English rendering of the most material part of it is given below :- "All persons versed in English literature unreservedly praise the famous

poetical dramas in English of the great poet Shakespeare because they are full of varied and wonderful poetic sentiments (RASAS). A mere acquaintance with the stories which form the themes of these great poems (Mahākāvya) fills the mind with the highest delight; and leading to an increase of thinking power, it produces the unspeakable but very tangible result of creating a sense of duty, inspiration for virtuous deeds, inclination towards such qualities of character as humility, generosity, fortitude, and aversion to selfishness and other forms of immoral conduct. In fact, in many places in his works, he fits such instructions into his text. It is for this reason that a German savant made the following remark, "How fortunate is England. The great poet, Shakespeare, departed from this world long ago, yet his works remain to this day and like experienced teachers dispense various instructions and multifarious knowledge about multifarious subjects." Next follows a tribute to Lamb's Tales before the published publication of which Shakespeare was open only to those who were well-versed in English and a sealed book to those who had a moderate knowledge of it. After this the preface continues in the following vein:- "From the time when English education began to take an increasing hold on the country it has been the earnest wish of many that Shakespeare's works should be translated in the vernaculars and that the poetic sentiments and thoughts of his great poems should thus be made known to the broadminded true relishers of poetry (Rasajña) of this country, but the original works are very difficult in their composition and, specially,

they are metrical, .We think it is almost an impossible task to retain the sense and charm of the original in vernacular translations and this perhaps explains why people have so long refrained from undertaking such a task. However, it is our belief that more acquaintance with the stories of these unparalleled poems will give a substantial taste of the wonderful sentiments and thoughts embodied in them. It is such a thought it seems, that had led Mr and Miss Lamb to give the substance of the stories of twenty Shakespearian plays. It is not impossible to translate these stories and, therefore, we attempt here a translation of this collection of stories by them. A literal translation of English works fails to retain the sentiments and thoughts of the original- hence slight changes have been thought necessary in places .".

It is again a matter of some wonder that an orthodox Sanskritist should take upon himself the task of introducing Shakespear to his countrymen. No such thought as of a possible clash of ideals in respect of dramatic composition in the vernaculars resulting from the knowledge of Shakespeare seems to trouble him for he does not see any such sharp antithesis between the new Shakespearian model and the ancient de- model of his own country of which he is the traditional custodian. If any such strong contrast had existed according to his notions of the classical type, he would have been the last person to advocate the cause of Shakespeare. Some features of his preface are also quite remarkable. His emphasis on the presence in Shakespear's works of the various Rasas or poetic sentiments shows with what

criterion he judges the worth of Shakesperian dramas and arrives at his findings regarding them. Our contention regarding the Rase theory and its importance as a canon of Hindu criticism of literature is fully borne out by this repeated reference to Rases and Rasejñas i.e. poetic sentiments and their true relishers. He intentionally keeps his eyes shut to such artificial features as an opening prayer, a prologue and an epilogue as are absent from Shakesperian dramas for he is not apt to mistake them for what they are not i.e. as essential to the very being of dramatic compositions. He is, however, careful to find out whether that true aesthetic appeal according to his conception exists in Shakespeara or not. And he is more than satisfied. He also enters into the question of the possibilities of Shakesperian translations in the vernaculars and apprehends almost the same difficulties as we discuss in some details below. We would also do well to remember his insistence on the moral instructions that are derived from the study of Shakesperian plays for it is also a part of the orthodox ideal of the classical drama that Bharata enunciated. Though in subsequent literature this aspect is not very much emphasised, it is never wholly absent from Hindu judgment.

It was in 1853 that the first substantial rendering of a Shakesperian drama in an Indian language was achieved and it is needless to say that Bengal again leads. It is an adaptation of the Merchant of Venice called "Bhānumatī-Chittavilāsa" i.e. Portia and Bassanio. In order to understand the significance of this date we should note the educational activities in the country between 1835 and 1857 the dark

year of the outbreak of the Great Mutiny as well as the great year of the foundation of Universities in India. It took nine years from 1835 for the experiment in English education to prove itself a success beyond any civil. In the year 1854 another memorable year in the history of India's education, a famous despatch was sent home by the Government declaring the success of the experiment and urging the need for the establishment of three Universities in Bengal, Bombay and Madras. The recommendation was given effect to in the anxious days of the Mutiny and the three Universities which have done so much for India's moral uplift were ushered into being in 1857.

The production of 1853 precedes only by a year this famous Government document of 1854. It is not wrong to assume that the first intoxication of English education and Macaulay's unjust strictures on oriental learning, which were indeed believed to be as gospel truths coming as they did from a man of his calibre and reputation, completely doped Educated Indians and misdirected their literary activities. Their eyes were blinded to their ancient possessions and to the needs for and possibilities of vernacular literatures. Records of the period and later years bear unequivocal^{^o} testimony to this short-sightedness. It appears, however, that by 1854 the intoxication had begun to work itself off and a very significant recommendation in the famous despatch of the year is regarding the need for the study and cultivation of the vernaculars of the country side by side with the pursuit of Western science and literature. Thus the necessary corrective to Macaulay's one-sided advocacy is supplied here and it must have been

in response to a demand felt and voiced by the people themselves. The Shakespearian adaptation of 1853 is an evidence of this new consciousness trying to assert itself.

For the next Indian version of Shakespeare we have to wait for an unconscionable length of time- a period of eleven years. In 1864 the next version appears in Bengal again and it is an adaptation of Romeo and Juliet by the author of the 1853 production. It is named "Charu- Mulke- Chittahara"-an Indian name given to Juliet which means "She of the bewitching face that steals the heart". This rather unusual interval between the first and the second venture is to be explained by the intervention of an unusual political event. In 1857 broke out the Great Mutiny and the whole country was thrown into the unsettling commotion of a fierce struggle. It is no wonder that for a period of seven years which the country evidently took to recoup from the evil effects of a bloody contest literary efforts remained in abeyance. Ever since the work of translating or adapting Shakespeare has gone on without any violent break caused by an external agency, and nine other Indian languages besides Bengali have stepped in at different times and joined the task. Gujarati is second in the field and enters the arena in 1865 with two translations, one of the Comedy of Errors called Jodipabhale i.e. twin brothers and the other of Othello. Marathi follows two years later with a translation of Othello and a translation of Lamb's Tale of the "The Taming of the Shrew". Hindi does not come in till 1879 with an adaptation of The Comedy of Errors named Brahamajale Nataka. Urdu lags behind till the last decade of the 19th century and opens with a translation

of King Lear in 1893. Sindhi makes the first attempt in 1897 with an adaptation of the Merchant of Venice and has been resting on her oars ever since. Punjabi makes her entrance after the first decade of the 20th century is over i.e. 1911. Of the Dravidian languages, Canarese takes the lead with a prose version of the story of Cymbeline in 1881. Both Tamil and Telugu make the first bow almost simultaneously. Tamil slightly precedes by publishing an adaptation of Twelfth Night in 1892 and Telugu follows with an adaptation of Othello named Jayathredha Nataka.

It appears that from the last decade of the 19th century activity in regard to Shakespearian translations and adaptations has been more in evidence than in the period preceding and falling between 1848 and 1890. This is borne out by the number of such productions that were achieved between 1890 and 1915 up to which we have carried our investigations i.e. a period of 25 years, which is larger than the number produced in the preceding 42 years. This is not to be wondered at when we remember that Urdu, Tamil and Telugu did not begin the work of translation and adaptation till the last decade of the 19th century had fairly set in. Ever since the work was begun in the principal languages it has been almost consistently carried on without any serious gaps of intermission. Bengal, however, shows an unexpected departure in this respect. Bengal alone started the work before the Great Mutiny of 1857 and the gap which yawns between the production of 1853 and the next achievement of 1864 is explained by the disturbances caused by that upheaval. From 1864 to 1878 there

is always a translation or an adaptation at decent intervals of one to four years. But from 1878 begins another hiatus which puts into insignificance the one following the Mutiny. It extends over sixteen long years and the next version of Shakespeare does not appear till 1894. This strange phenomenon requires elucidation for it cannot be a freak of nature considering the fact that the literary activities of Bengal have increased from year to year and have not yet shown any sign of exhaustion. The real explanation of this interregnum is the extraordinary literary activities of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee in the domain of fiction. Indeed the period almost coincides with what Mr R. C. Datta calls Bankim's period in his History of the Literature of Bengal. It is also the period of Girish Chandra's dramatic activities in the establishment of the Bengali stage and writing and producing original Indian plays. Gujarati shows a similar interval extending from 1876 to 1893 and the only reason we are able to find for it is that it is not yet very greatly advanced and its activities were rather slow at that period. It is, however, not so in the case of Bengali.

In going through the list of these Indian versions of Shakespeare, one is struck by the number of adaptations which far exceeds the number of translations. From our list it appears that less than one third of these productions are translations. There must have been strong causes in operation which contributed towards such a result and an attempt to discover them is worth our while. The work of translation is always a very difficult task and for its success, its demands are highly exacting and multifarious. The

first requisite is adequate capacity of the translator himself and no less is the capacity of the language itself in which translation has to be done. It would not be an exaggeration to say that to render Shakespeare successfully in any foreign tongue would presuppose in the translation a capacity which approximates very nearly to Shakespeare's own unrivalled genius and such a thing has been rare and will for ever remain rare in this world, even if it were taken for granted that the instrument of language to be wielded by the translator possessed the same genius as the English language-Shakespeare's own instrument-has. Both these possibilities are beyond all hopes of fulfilment. It is extremely doubtful if Shakesperian translations in any country have been successful even to such an extent as to form a good substitute for the original works. Then Shakespeare is not a mere dramatist; he is one of the greatest poets of the world and an unrivalled singer in English. We know how least poetry lends itself to translation in a foreign medium for its thoughts and expressions are so intimately wedded together that you separate the one from the other, what remains is nothing but the ruins of a noble shape. These peculiar expressions in which a poet's thoughts are embodied as living sparks are the poet's own and cannot be imitated even by a fellow craftsman of his native tongue, not to speak of one who has to imitate them in an altogether different medium. Then, what about the music in the entrancing envelopment of which his spiritual experience, his thoughts and sentiments glow, sparkle, and issue in ravishing strains to captivate the ears and hold in bondage the overpowered heart? This music forms the very soul of it

and dismember it from a particular poem, a lifeless ~~car-~~
 carcass stares you in the face in all its ghastly frigidity
 with all the warmth of life and colour for ever gone
 from it. This music is the special device of a language
 carefully suited to its peculiar genius and hardly can you
 transfer it to a different medium. A good approach to it
 might be found but its equal - no, never.

The above are common impediments of translations and
 have acted as deterrents in India. But India had her
 special difficulties. It has been remarked that at the time
 English education was introduced in India and Shakespeare
 was made known, Sanskrit as the common medium of literary
 expression for the whole of India had ceased to exist and its
 cultivation for future literary purposes of India was not
 even ~~ordered~~ considered a practical issue. It remains a
 debatable question what this great classical language with
 its wonderful capabilities might have accomplished in the
 way of rendering Shakespearian dramas. As it is, there is
 only one solitary instance of such enterprise in Sanskrit
 and it is an adaptation of "A Midsummer Night's Dream" ~~now~~
 named Vasantikasvapna by R. Krsnamacari (See Schuyler's
 Bibliography of the Sanskrit Drama, page 63). Even in the
 heyday of its glory, the knowledge of Sanskrit was never
 anything like widespread. Its culture has been always ~~and~~
 exclusive specially with regard to the holy books and
 certain classes were denied any access to it. Thus, with the
 new conception of education, its needs, function and demo-
 cratic ~~sep--~~ scope introduced by the virus of Western
 knowledge, it was not possible to return to Sanskrit. Naturally

attention came to be turned in the direction of the various spoken tongues and their possibilities having been explored, energies were directed towards improving what literatures they possessed from the past, and where no such inheritance existed, to founding a new literature.

It has already been pointed out that Shakespeare has been translated and adapted in these vernacular languages as they have been rescued from neglect and indifference of former ages and been gradually developed. The two processes in many cases have gone on together, and in such an event the capacity of a vernacular tongue could not be thought quite adequate to, & translating Shakespeare. In the case of Tamil, as we have seen, as recently as in 1911, its vocabulary was not thought sufficiently developed for describing complex mental conditions and feelings or fine shades of character with which, of course, Shakespeare's plays abound. It is no wonder, then, that under such conditions & more adaptations and less translations would be attempted. It is possible to take any kind of liberties with the first kind. Any difficulties can be avoided by omissions or alterations and they will be overlooked and forgiven for no pretension is there advanced as to presenting Shakespeare as he is, and thus no disrespect is shown to him which might call for resentment and even correction.

The existence in India of a fairly large, watchful and mercilessly critical public who, from their first-hand knowledge of Shakespeare's plays, will rigorously scrutinise any

production pretending to be a translation, has also acted as a set-back in this direction. India in this respect is differently circumstanced from other foreign countries and this has been already noted. It would be untrue to say that such pretentious versions as profess to be translations, but are, in reality, not so, or have failed to reach the standard, do not exist. In fact very few of the translations are up to the mark. They are mostly prose renderings, not unoften of the most literal type even to ^{the} point of doing great violence to the genius of the medium employed. The point we want to make is that the number of such trans^lations has been wholesomely ^{kept} ~~left~~ down by the fear of that vigilant criticism of which we have spoken.

But besides these difficulties which are inherent in the very nature of trans^lations, rendered no doubt acute in India by the existence of a large English educated public, there have been other very potent causes, not to be found in European countries, operating in the same direction. The question of translations versus adaptations has been very seriously debated by all who have tried to render Shakespeare in the ~~Indian~~ Indian languages and the prefaces written by them to their versions of Shakespeare bristle with discussions of this topic. After all, it will not do to ignore that the East differs in many respects from the West. These differences are no doubt mainly concerned with the superficialities of social customs and manners but, none the less, they are very real and important in the eyes of those who are ignorant of the rival culture, civilisation and its traditions. It has been

asked often and often-" Who are those for whom these Shakesperian translations are intended ? For whom are we to cater ? And the reply has been invariably the same- " The English educated would not ∇ care for them for greater profit and pleasure they will derive from the original. Our work is intended for the edification of those who are ignorant of English and have no access to the original ." This being so, it is necessary that anything in the original that might be calculated to create in them a feeling of strangeness and so of unintelligibility and even hostility must be either omitted or altered so as to be made acceptable to their taste. Thus pure translations are out of the question. Modified translations or better adaptations of these plays are the things that are needed in India. Let us quote below from some of these prefaces to see how the question has been mooted in its various aspects.

In the first Indian adaptation of Shakespeare Harsochandra Ghosh appends two prefaces to his work (Bhanuvasati-Chittavilasa # 1858), one in English and another in Bengali. He expresses himself as follows in the Bengali preface:- " At the instance of a sagacious Englishman who is an enthusiast for the cause of India's education, I began to make a literal translation in Bengali of the famous drama " The Merchant of Venice " by the great English poet Shakespeare. But seeing that the thoughts and sentiments of many passages in it were opposed to the thoughts and sentiments of Indian literature, I was advised by a few wise and old gentlemen to compose a drama according to Indian manner on the basis of Shakespeare's

story. I felt the suggestion as very reasonable and have accordingly written "Bhanumati - Chittaviles/c" - a drama in prose and verse mixed. Though it is not a faithful translation of Shakespeare, yet I have followed the whole story very closely and have, in the main, retained Shakespeare's thoughts and sentiments. Nevertheless, a comparison with the original will reveal changes and additions in many places and this has been done so that the work may prove a pleasant reading to Indians in their hours of leisure. If this play succeeds in meeting with the approval of Indian gentlemen, I shall consider my labours successful and fruitful."

In 1864 the same author brought out his second venture an adaptation of Romeo and Juliet (Charumukha - Chittahara) and the preface to it states:- "Some time ago a friend of mine, a lover of letters, asked me to render in the language of the country and in oriental dress the English dramatic poem Romeo and Juliet.... My friends's desire was that this book instead of being written in high-flown Bengali prose, should be rendered in ordinary spoken but refined Bengali so as to be of interest to the people in general and also capable of re-presentation on the stage. I have acted according to his wishes. I have not, however, spared any pains to preserve as much as possible of the unique charm and wealth of ideas of the original so far as they have been found consistent with the different conditions of a foreign country and the different genius of a foreign tongue. Let it not be thought that I have transferred Italian Romeo and Juliet to India and transformed them beyond all recognition. That is an

impossible task. The intention of my friend who originally proposed the translation to me was merely to see what result would follow if the scene of the play were shifted from Italy to India and Romeo and Juliet were turned into a pair of Indian lovers dressed in the strange costume of the country
 "...."

In the preface to a Merhathi translation of Julius Caesar (Vijaya singha 1872) we are told that it is not a literal transpotation of the English original. "Whatever in the names/ or in the story is likely to prove strange and unfamiliar to the country is altered.". In a bengali edition of "The Merchant of Venice" published in 1877 (Suralata Nataka) the author remarks in the preface:- "My chief aim is to make this work in some ways suitable for those who are unable to read the original. I have reluctantly avoided European names, imageries etc. for they do not fit the character of Bengali books. However, I have not spared pains to see that the language is not strained, also that the thought and character of the original are retained.....Those who have attempted the task know very well how difficult it is to translate an English work in chaste Bengali, not to speak of a drama containing colloquial language. Faithful translation and at the same time use of chaste Bengali are impossibilities. The style of composition in each is different, thoughts are different, tastes are opposed, customs, manners and characters differ enormously, even the figures of speech employed do not agree. Consequently, in spite of infinite labour and pains, complete identity between the translation and the original is hard to maintain." In an

adaptation of *Cymbeline* (Tara Natuka 1879) Vishnu Morasware Mahajani in the course of a long preface inveighs against all Shakesperian translations in the following vein:- "These translations serve merely the purpose of young students of Shakespeare. Those who know only their mother-tongue Marathi do not find any pleasure in them as foreign customs and manners are unintelligible to them and they fail to derive that amusement which is expected from the perusal of dramas. Those who know English well do not care for these translations and never read them. Those who do not know English sufficiently well also do not read these translations as they are unintelligible. These translations cannot reveal the beauty of Shakespeare to those who know no other language than their own." After this condemnation of Shakesperian translations he declares himself in favour of adaptations on the ground that Shakespeare in Marathi is really meant for those who are ignorant of English and to be acceptable to their taste anything that is contrary to Indian customs and manners must be altered. Only what is in keeping with such customs and manners can be retained. Consequently additions and alterations are bound to occur in Indian versions of Shakespeare and thus translations are impossible. Sir Edwin Arnold seems to be of the same opinion about these translations, which he expresses in the preface contributed by him to a Hindi translation of *The Merchant of Venice* (*Veniz Nagarkabyapari* by Arya, 1880). He writes - "Of course such a transcript cannot reproduce the character of Shakespeare's majestic verse, nor give more than

then the general meaning of his play, but even this may prove of considerable service to a Hindu student reading the play, who will often be assisted towards better comprehension of the English text by the simple exposition which is here afforded. "

The case has been very forcibly and with great judgment put by a great Bengali poet Ham Chandra Bandyopadhyaya whose versions of "Romeo and Juliet" and "The Tempest" are both remarkable successes. In the very valuable preface which he writes to his first attempt "Romeo and Juliet", he says:-

" This drama is an imitation and not a translation of Romeo and Juliet. A mere translation of an English work loses all poetic and other charms for the simple reason that, owing to the native differences of English and Bengali tongues which are considerable, and also owing to the divergences of local customs and manners, religious ideas etc., such a translation becomes unpleasing both to the ear and the eye and hardly pleases the taste of Bengali readers. This consideration has swayed me in writing a drama in imitation of Romeo and Juliet. I have either discarded altogether or altered some portions of the original and have also introduced one or two new scenes. I have rechristened the dramatic personae with Indian names and given a local colour to their speeches but as far as the leading characters are concerned, I have tried to preserve their thoughts and characteristics intact as in the original. What I have really attempted to do is that I have taken the flavour of Shakespeare's play and the essential traits of the character of his principal dramatic

persons and thrown them into an Indian mould in order to
 meet the demands of the taste of Indian readers..... My own
 idea is that unless some such method is adopted, no foreign
 drama will secure a place in Bengali literature and thus
 the nourishment of Bengali literature and the improvement
 of its quality will be retarded. When this method has been
 followed for a sufficient length of time, then the time may come
 when pure translations of foreign works will be welcome
 into Bengali literature. But for the present the method I have
 indicated recommends itself to me". Another Bengali litterateur
 of considerable reputation who has to his credit a successful
 translation of Othello (Rudrasena, 1907), Nanilal Bandopadhyaya
 writes similarly in the preface to his version:- "In order
 to make this Bengali translation of Othello of easy compre-
 hension to ordinary Bengali readers, I have substituted for
 foreign names of characters and the places where scenes are
 laid Indian names. As it has been necessary to fit the work
 in with the local and social customs of India, it has not
 been possible to attempt a literal translation everywhere..
 Therefore, in some places, merely the sense has been retained
 and occasionally elsewhere some foreign sentiments have had
 to be omitted from the fear that they might appear out of
 place in an Indian setting. For instance, such an omission
 occurs in the first scene of the second act where a portion
 of the conversation that is carried on between Iago, Emilia
 and Desdemona has been deleted." As late as in 1914, the same
 opinion is expressed by a translation of the Winter's tale
 (Reni Tamlini"). Bhupade Charan Mitra, the author of this

piece, is not a known figure in Bangali literature, but he will certainly be remembered as one of the few successful ~~trans-~~ translations of a Shakesperian drama. In the preface to his work he writes :- " This publication is a Bangali translation of the Winter's Tale by the great poet Shakespeare. Slight changes both in expressions and subject matter have been rendered necessary in order to make the customs and characters of the original acceptable to ^{the} taste of Bangali readers and to give sweetness and refinement to the language of the translation, though, in the main, this work is a close translation of the original drama. Any thinking man will easily realise that unless some such method is followed in the translation of foreign poems, dramas or other kinds of literature having a strong poetic flavour, a translation in the majority of instances fails to be pleasing to the readers of this country and will never come to be claimed as its own by Bangali literature. If a translation is strictly literal, it may serve the purpose of an expository key to students of that ~~foreign~~ ^{foreign} language and as such may be valued, but from it can never be derived in full measure that pleasure combined with instruction which is the chief and real aim of all literary studies. Just as the desired impression fails to be ~~etc~~ awakened in the mind of a reader if the sentiments, characters, description of things and events in a translation prove unfamiliar, so if it contains anything contrary to the religious and social customs of the country or if it is clothed in harsh language that smacks of a foreign source, repugnance instead of delight results in the mind of the reader. The very

mention of the names of Mallika, Malati, (Indian flowers) Golep (Rose) naturally awaken in us a mental perception of their beauty as well as fragrance, but the mention of the names of daffodils, tulips, dahlias, instead of producing such a pleasurable sensation, will, on the contrary, fill the mind of a reader ignorant of English with a strange, uncomfortable feeling. We are easily charmed with such descriptions of a woman's beauty as "with bee-black hair", "with eyes like a deer's", but the mere imagination of an amorous glance from a golden haired, "cat-eyed" i.e. grey-eyed foreign beauty will create in our hearts a feeling of repulsion. Such imageries as "palms soft as the feathers of a dove", "chaste and pure as the white snow hanging from the temple of Diana" may appear pleasing and apt to a student of European literature a ball-dance in which the lady's arms are locked round the neck of one other than her husband may be tasteful to a European. But to an Indian such images appear feeble and such customs offensive. In brief, in translating foreign works of literature in Bengali the mere literal rendering of the original does not suffice, but the ideas, characters, descriptions of things and events have to be altered in order to commend themselves to Indian taste. An English home to be made habitable for a Hindu must be altered in accordance with Hindu taste and customs. Just as it is incumbent on a Hindu to replace therein the Englishman's ball-room, billiard-room, smoking-room by rooms set apart for worship and the household gods, so, according to my humble opinion, it is necessary to transform foreign literary works in accordance

with our national ideals.

I have in translating this drama followed the method which is dictated by the above considerations. In the original play it appears that Polixenes, the King of Bohemia, lived for a length of time in the house of his childhood's friend Leontes as a guest and was treated as a member of the family and was permitted to be on terms of the greatest intimacy with his friend's beautiful consort. Such a custom which allows such an extent of intimacy to the guest is contrary to the social rule of our country and will appear unnatural in the eyes of our society. It is for this reason that in the translation the King of Ceylon (The King of Bohemia) has not only been made a friend of the King of Malaya (Leontes) but also a first cousin by the mother's side. In the original in the last scene the somewhat elderly widow of Antigonus disconsolate at her husband's loss is married as a consolation to elderly Camillo. Such a thing is calculated to revolt Indian taste and to look extremely outlandish. Hence, the lady is depicted as remaining to the end a widow practising austerities. Besides these, in the fourth act an attempt has been made to create an Indian atmosphere in the songs of Autolycus and his vending of his wares. This has also been tried in the description of the flowers that Perdita presents to the guests at the feast . "

Long before, in the early stages of Shakesperian translations and adaptations, Pandit Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar, one of the makers of modern Bengali literature, felt the same difficulties in producing his version of the story of the Comedy of Errors . He writes in the preface defending his substitution of Indian names ^{for} ~~from~~ foreign names:- " In Bengali books European names

are not pleasing to the ear; especially they are annoying to such readers as are ignorant of English. In order to avoid this defect, in my *Vrantī-vileśya* (Comedy of Errors) Indian names have been substituted for foreign names. It cannot be in the least harmful or improper to adopt such a method in a story. Names have not the same importance and usefulness in a story as they have in a history or a biography."

The standpoint of those who are against pure translations of Shakespeare's works is sufficiently clear from the above quotations. The position of those who have attempted such translations is, however, not so clearly stated. Pandit Gopinath, a Hindi translator of two of Shakespeare's dramas "As you like it" (1897) and "Romeo and Juliet" (Pranallik, 1898) is forced, in the preface to his last named work, to reply to some charges brought against his first production. The charges are that his translation is a slavish imitation and it retains English thoughts and sentiments as they are ^{and} even copies tricks of English expressions. He ~~contends~~ contents himself with simply saying that he was prepared to meet with ridicule for the retention of English manner of speech, English customs, ideas and sentiments. But such ~~little~~ ridicule is pointless as his object has never been otherwise. He has never felt it to be his duty to lay a sacrilegious hand of pruning and clipping at his sweet will on such a perfect work filled with nectar-like sentiments. His real object has been to make Shakespeare intelligible preserving as much of the original as he could. It will appear from this defence that he shirks the real issue viz: the literary merits of

such translations, and how far such translations are calculated to yield that higher kind of pleasure and profit derivable from the study of the original works. To make Shakespeare intelligible may be a worthy object, but it is surely on a much lower level and is useful only to those who need assistance towards better comprehension of the English text, after going through the original.

The suspicion that some such motive off rendering Shakespeare more easily comprehensible to youthful students of English literature has inspired these translations does not seem to be wholly groundless. At least the manner in which most of these translations have been carried out does not warrant a higher faith in them. Some of these translations especially in Marathi contain long introductions dealing with ^{the} biography of Shakespeare, bibliography of his works, the chronological order of their writing, the sources from which the work under translation is borrowed by Shakespeare, determination of the date of its first publication and finally discussions regarding the characters of the play. The following translation of the Bengali preface to one such production Jhenjha (Tempest) 1913 will show the author's peculiar notions of Shakespearian translations: "It is feared that general readers will feel inconvenience in using this book from the absence of footnotes that are required by the present Regulations of the Calcutta University. Next time an attempt will be made to remove this want. It is the chief aim of this series (Sarvedhikari Series—ambitiously conceived but never carried beyond the work under notice) to produce unabridged Bengali versions of all Shakespearian works. Incidentally we have inserted discussions of

grammatical niceties of Shakespeare's day, wordmeanings, styles of composition and variant readings. Generally the Cambridge text has been followed but opportunities for discussions of prominent different readings in the Quartos and the Folios have not been missed. We have tried in our translations to preserve the original beauty of such places as have led modern commentators to disagree either in respect of the explanation of some lines or in respect of the analysis of the traits of a particular character. We have followed the original in its use of rhymed or unrhymed verse. Still on account of the native difference of the two tongues, also to help the understanding of those readers who do not know English, a quite different ~~native~~ metre has been used and Indian sentiments have been inserted in places.

Now, if this work is considered worthy of being studied and taught (in Schools and Colleges) I shall deem my labours crowned with success."

A Marathi translation of Henry VIII (Raja Raghunath—
Rane 1904) Hanuman Bopurva Atré essays an answer to the contention that even a good translation for its proper appreciation ~~needs~~ changes in respect of divergent foreign customs and manners, sentiments and ideas. As far as his particular work is concerned, it turns on an event which is peculiarly foreign to Indian notions and if left out or changed would have ~~been~~ made his task impossible. Henry's marrying his brother's widow and the subsequent divorce of Katherine on the score of its illegality^{AA} are ideas essentially distasteful to Indian conception, but they form the very core of the drama. Thus the translator¹ is driven to his defence.

He simply states in the preface that under the influence of English education and contact with English men and women, Indian customs are being so rapidly Westernised that such foreign customs as the marrying of a brother's widow, the divorce of a wife, drinking and dancing together of men and women as in the Presence-Chamber of Cardinal Wolsey's Palace are not likely to be considered odd and strange and thus to interfere with the proper enjoyment of the drama. He also considers the question of the substitution of Indian names for English names and curiously enough makes a concession in this respect. He fears that the retention of English names in the play might by their unfamiliarity lead to *Rasbhanga* i. e. to weakening of that poetic relish/flavour on the full production of which its success as a piece of literature depends. Altogether this work which is a successful pure translation of the Shakespearian drama is a very interesting production. All the circumstances and incidents of the original are retained without the least attempt at alteration on the score of their being foreign and strange in Indian eyes. But Indian characters are substituted for English characters on the score of their being unfamiliar.

Evidently the author is heading for very grave anachronism between the characters and the circumstances in which they are placed and he is driven to a very ingenious device to ward it off. In the list of dramatic personae he puts the English names first and against them he places the corresponding Indian names to denote that the Indian names used in the body of the book are merely introduced as a matter of convenience to readers and that they are really doing duty for English men

and women. A curious device indeed! To what shifts are not these translators reduced!*

It will now be fully grasped why adaptations of Shakespeare are more in vogue in India than translations. It is not merely the different genius of an Indian language that creates the difficulty. Such difficulties there no doubt exist and Indian authors are fully cognisant of them, but they are not always wholly insuperable. The possibilities of a language always depend on the wielder of it and in the hands of master craftsmen it sometimes rises to heights commonly unexpected of it. Of course, it is not our intention to say that even then it would be possible to transfer to a translation all the beauties and graces of the original Shakespeare, especially when the translation is in a language the genius of which differs so greatly from the genius of the English language. The majesty of Shakespeare's verses, for instance, will always elude any attempt to transplant it. Still, it is possible in one or two advanced vernaculars of India to produce such translations as would retain much of Shakespeare, and what is more important, would give the true relish of literature. But these inherent difficulties of the medium being partially overcome, the obstacles are not wholly removed. They are more widespread than that. As has been noticed, they begin with such a simple thing as the names of the dramatic personae and then spread through all the peculiarities in an Indian's eyes of customs, manners, sentiments and ideals and reach down to imageries, similes, metaphors, conceits and allusions to Greek and Latin legends and fables of the well-known classical type so

much used and so very familiar in European literature and so foreign to an Indian.

Thus the consensus of opinion among Indians who have so far tried to render Shakespeare's plays in the Indian vernaculars decidedly inclines towards adaptations. It would be interesting to illustrate from such works how they have tried to carry out their task. Let us take, for instance, the first Indian rendering of a Shakespearian play viz: "Bhānumati - Chittavilāsa" a Bengali adaptation of "The Merchant of Venice" (1853). The scene is transferred to India and is partly at Ujjain and partly at Gujrat. The following list of the dramatic personae will show how all the characters are made Indian and also how additional characters are introduced to accord with Indian conditions :-

The list of the dramatic personae in the adaptation.

Vīravara- King of Ujjain (Portia's father).

Saktidhara - An Official and a Judge.

Vishnu Sarmā - The Royal Priest.

Kendarpakatu- Prince of Kasi. } suitors to

Vijaya-Ketu - Prince of Kalinga. } Bhānumatī corresponding to
Prince of Morocco & Arrogon.

Chārudatta- A Shipowner of Gujrat (Antonio)

Chittavilāsa- his friend and suitor to Bhānumati (Bassanio)
(Gratiano)

Chitrasana }

Jayadeva } friends & followers of Chārudatta (Salanio)

Sahadeva } and Chittavilāsa. (Salarino)

- Chandraseena- a bosom friend of Cherudatta and
Chittavilasa, in love with Sasī mukhī. (Lorenzo).
- Lakshapati Rāy- A highly usurious, parsimonious moneylender
of Oujrat (Shylock).
- Senapati Rāy- his relation and protégé (Tubal).
- mulāl Dās - a rustic servant to the Moneylender (Launcelot).
- Nandalāl - father to mulāl (old Gobbo).
- Kālu Rāy - a barber and an astrologer.
- Geṅgā Nāyaka- Match-maker of Ujjain and the King's Ambassador.
- Sadānanda- a court buffoon .
- Chandrāvalī- The queen of Ujjain (Bhenumati's mother).
- Bhenumati - her daughter (Portia).
- Sulochanā - her waiting maid .
- Susīlā - daughter of the King's Minister and companion
to Bhenumati (Nerissa).
- Sasīmukhī - daughter to Lakshapati (Jessica).
- Sāhitrī- wife - to Lakshapati.
- Sevikā - her maid.
- Mālātī - wife to Kaluray and a shrew.
- Vilāsa- wife to Sadananda, the buffoon.

Other officers of the court, Geolers, Judge, mace-bearers
swordbearers, Sentinels, dancers, both male and female, courtiers
etc., etc.,

It will be seen from the above list that as many as
- twelve new characters are added, while the two men servants
to Portia are significantly omitted. Of course most of these
additional characters are not needed for the purpose, - Kālu Rāy
and his wife Mālātī, Sadananda and his wife Vilāsa are super-
fluities; so are Lakshapati's wife who is kept alive and
her maid. From the preface we know the authors 's professed

object was to write on the shakasparian theme a bengali Nataka and we shall discuss in the proper place what he meant by it. It may be stated here - that except in regard to the story in its main outlines and the well-known passages where Shakespeare's thoughts and sentiments are at their highest and best, which are retained, this production is almost an original work.

In the very first scene of the first act the conventional Indian note is struck. Bhanumati's (Portia) parents are alive and she has arrived at the marriageable age matchless in beauty and accomplishments. King Viravara, her father, as usual, is seemingly apathetic in the matter of finding a suitable bride-groom for her and her mother. Queen Chandravali in the conventional way takes the king to task for his indifference in such a grave matter. Then we are told that the King is not really indifferent and that he and his minister have hit on the device of the three caskets for the choice of a husband for his daughter. It is an improvement on the usual method of swayamvara or self-choice to which ancient Indian princesses were accustomed.

Of other examples of concessions made to Indian customs, the scenes in which Kenderpaketa and Vijayaketa, prince of Kasi and Kalinga (Princes of Morocco and Arragon) make abortive efforts to choose the right casket are conspicuous ones. Bhanumati with her maid and companion Sulochana and Gushila is present there but keeps herself behind a screen. The caskets cannot be pointed out to the Princes by Bhanumati or her maids for ladies are not allowed to appear publicly and

before strangers. Hence the need of the agency of Ganganyak, the matchmaker, who does this duty. Similarly in the scene of Chitta-Vilasa's (Bassanio) choice of the caskets Shannumati is present behind a screen and from there addresses to him the famous speech:- "I pray you, tarry, pause a day or two etc." which is retained in substance much as in the original. The most remarkable instance, however, occurs in a song which is put into the mouth of Dulal (Launcelot Gobbo). It cannot be said that such a serious song of otherworldliness of which a free rendering is given below, is demanded by the strict requirements of Indianising the play. The character of Dulal is kept humorous as in the original and the grotesqueness of such a song from him entirely escaped the notice of the author. It only represents on his part an undue attempt to capture popular fancy, for the sentiments of this song are very popular sentiments and have an unfeeling appeal to the hearts of the generality of the people. The song may be rendered as follows:-

"Fix thy thought on the Lord,- no man nor woman
canst thou claim as thy own,-

Think of that passionless Being, O Mind, that is manifest,
Yet passeth all understanding.

Failing to know Him, thou art full of idle cares,
Think of Him alone, if thou wouldst cross the ocean of
this world.

Dangerous is the thought of worldly possessions, banish
all such thoughts.

Free from care, think of that Source of all thoughts.
Fix thy thought on the Lord,- no man nor woman canst
thou claim as thy own."

It has already been remarked that the above production is not so much an adaptation of Shakespeare as a new play on

the theme of the Merchant of Venice. Hence the introduction of so many new characters and new situations which are not strictly required to adapt Shakespeare to Indian taste. Let us see how this work of adaptation has been carried out in another Bengali version of the same play. This is *Suralata Nataka* by Pyarilal Mukhopadhyay published in 1877. The list of the dramatic personae is as follows:-

Sūrasingha--	Prince of Kalinga	Princes of Morocco and Arragon
Simāta- Vāhana-	Prince of Ceylon	
Pharmashil---	a rich shipowner of	Vilvanagar (Antonio)
Vasanta Kumār -	his friend	(Bessanio)
Sushil		(salanio)
Sarachandrea		(salarino)
Vijayakrishna	friends to Pharmashil and Vasanta Kumar.	(Gratiano)
ChandrasekharaH---	suitor of Vilasini	(Lorenzo).
Somadatta--	a money lender, now resident in vilvanagar -----	(Shylock).
Ratnadatta ----	his friend (Tubal)	
Satyuka-----	servant to Somadatta	(Leuciolet Gobbo)
Old Nidhā-----	his father	(Old Gobbo).
Petārām -----	servant to Vasanta Kumar	(Leonardo).
Sādhu-----		(Balthesar)
Rama-----	servants to Suralata	(Stefano).
Suralatā -----	a rich maiden of Ratnagare	(Portia).
Virajā-----	her friend and maid	(Narissa).
Vilāsini -----	daughter to Somadatta	(Jessica).

The King , Courtiers , Gaoler , Sentinels etc., etc.

Scene :- Partly as at Vilvanagara , and partly at Ratnāgara.

There is not a single additional character in this work for such is not really needed for purposes of adaptation. Only Indian characters have been substituted for foreign characters and all the scenes of action have been transferred to India. No new situations are invented; in this respect Shakespeare is followed as faithfully as possible. Most of the Indian adaptations of Shakespeare are of this

nature except when there is an attempt to cast a version in the mould of an Indian drama or when merely the story is taken and a new work is written. In the mass, in such a work, Shakespeare is freely translated, sometimes closely, some times with a good deal of curtailment and omissions, accordingly to the capacity of the adapter. In the work under notice omissions are particularly noticeable in the humorous speeches of Launcelot. As far as this humour consists in male-propisms, it is impossible to retain them and whenever there is any suspicion of indelicacy about it, it is religiously avoided. It should be noted here that anything indelicate and offensive to the taste of the modern age, is, as a rule, strictly eschewed by Indian translators and adapters alike. Modifications and alterations there are, which are demanded by the altered environments in the midst of which the characters are placed. In rendering that immortal idyllic scene between Lorenzo and Jessica in the beginning of scene I, Act V. the classical allusions are all Indianised. For Troilus, Thisbe, and Nido, who are unknown to Indian readers ignorant ^{of} English, are substituted Ramachandra sighing for Sita on the seashore and looking longingly across the dividing waters towards the gates of Lanka, and Radhika mad with love for Krishna, wandering about demented in the forest in search of her beloved. In the speech of Lorenzo in the same scene beginning with "The reason is, your spirits are attentive -" the allusion to Orpheus and the power of his music over trees, stocks and stones is converted into an allusion to Tensana a similar legendary figure in

Indie, who could ~~sell~~^{melt} even stones by the charm of his songs. In Portia's speech "The crow doth sing as sweetly as the lark etc." in the same scene, the lark has got to be replaced by the cuckoo and the nightingale by the "Chakravak". In the last scene the ribald joke about "Cuckold" and the indelicate humour of the doctor and his clerk being in their beds with the ladies are scrupulously ignored.

Similarly in Marathi adaptation of the play the characters are Marathi characters and changes are often introduced in respect of anything that might appear as foreign and thus unintelligible. Let us take up the play *Strin^{nya}achaturyya* (the forensic skill of a woman), an adaptation of the "Merchant of Venice" (1871) by Atmaram Vinayaka Patkar. The scene is laid in Srinagar in India and in place of the Duke of Venice we have the Rana of Srinagar. No new character is added. Antonio is Amarsingh, Bassanio Rajat-singh, Shylock is Somachanda, a Marwari money-lender. Young Lancelot is Brahmadin Chauval, Lorenzo is Lakshmi Prasad, Portia Vasantamala, Nerissa Nira and Jessica Jasavati. The play is an adaptation so far as the alterations of the names of the dramatic personae go and Indian environments are introduced; otherwise Shakespeare is followed in acts, scenes and an attempt is made to translate him. Some oddities are perpetrated in this way. For example, Portia's description of her suitors in scene II, Act I, is transferred to Indian Princes who are candidates for Vasantamala's hand and who are described by her in the corresponding scene. We know Portia festens on the national traits of these European

Princes and therefore they ill apply to the Indian princes of Kishal, Panchal, Hastanapur, Gandhar, Malilala^{ny}, Kerashtak, Saurashtra and naturally become flat and pointless in the adaptation. The author is, however, careful to introduce necessary modifications in several places. Such passages as Shakespeare's attempt to justify usury by citing the case of Jacob's hire (Act I. Sc. III.) will hardly fit in with Indian conditions and hence, instead of the Biblical authority, Manusmriti is quoted as an authority for the legality of usury by the wily Marwari. In Portia's speech just before Bassanio's choice of the caskets- "Away then! I am locked in one of them etc., " the allusion to young Alcides and his miraculous feat (ll. 53-62) can hardly be retained in an adaptation. In its place an Indian classical story of the same nature is introduced. Vasantamala compares herself to the maiden who was offered as a sacrifice by the people of Mithila to the demon Vakasura in order to appease his wrath and to buy indemnity for the city from his merciless devastations. The people congregated and stood aloof to see the acceptance of the sacrifice by the ugly monster, when lo and behold! Bhima, the Indian Hercules, appeared on the scene and miraculously rescued the defenceless virgin from the cruel jaws of the monster after doing him to death. Rajatsingh is compared to Bhima and the feat of choosing the right casket is likened to the feat performed by him in slaying Vakasura. When Shylock exclaims "A Daniel come to judgment" (I. 229, Act IV, Sc. 1) this allusion to Daniel is incomprehensible to Indians. So Somchanda is made to say the God "Adinatha" has come down to dispense justice : Similarly ; the

famous stories of love of old, of Troilus and Cressid, of Thisbe, of Dido, of Medea etc., (Act V. Sc 1) are converted into Indian love stories of Srikrishna and Rukmini, of Sita and Rama, of Harishchandra and Taramati, of Mendodari and her husband Ravana. The allusion to Orpheus in the same scene is turned into an allusion to Tansen the wielder of similar powers over inanimate nature by the magic of his songs.

Hemchandra Bandopadhyaya, whom we quoted as making a very strong and reasoned case against Shakespearian translations in Bengali and whose two adaptations, one of Romeo and Juliet and the other of the "Tempest" are highly successful works, avinces in his first production a very clever method of Indigenising the names of the dramatic personae as well as of the places where the scenes are laid. Verona is made Verena and Mantua Manchua. The names of the hero and the heroine are kept as in Shakespeare, Paris becomes Parash, Cepulot and Montague Kapalat and Mantago, Mercutio, Verakesh, Benvolio Venuval, Tybalt Teibal, Sampson and Gregory the two servants to Cepulot are Shambho and Gire, Abraham is Abhiram and so on. It will be noticed that the abruptness of the change is softened as much as possible so that familiarity with such names may at one time make the return to original names not strange and revolting. Some such motive must have been in the mind of the author when he thought of this device for we have seen that Hemchandra is not really opposed to translations of Shakespeare's works; only he thinks that the time for them is not yet and

will not be until English education has sufficiently filtered down to the lower layers of society. This particular device of Hamchandre is very difficult to follow in every case for very few foreign names will lend themselves to such mild alterations in order to be effectively Indianised. He has not been able to keep it up in his adaptation of "The Tempest". We mention this peculiar instance of Hamchandre's effort merely to show in what various ways Indian renderers of Shakespeare have tried to make their works agreeable to those for whom they are primarily intended.

This production is a very interesting study from the standpoint of the various changes and innovations inserted as a concession to the Indian taste. Some new characters have been added in order to obviate what the author considers to be the difficulty of an awkward foreign custom. For example, in the very first scene, when the quarrel between the partisans of the two rival houses is on, in the original enter Cepulet and Montague with their wives and are prevented with difficulty by them from joining the fray. Such public appearance of ladies in the street will not be thought proper in Bengal. Hence in the adaptation we have Cepulet and Montague attended by two male friends instead of by their wives and these two characters are additions. In Act I. Sc II in the original Paris and Cepulet freely enter into a conversation on the subject of the former's desire to marry Juliet but in the adaptation a friend of Cepulet deputizes for Paris and acts as his spokesman. For in India it would hardly look correct for a young man to approach in this way the father of the girl and ask him for his daughter's hand. In the same

scene in the original there is no humour intended in the list of guests that is handed over to Romeo by Cepulet's servant in order to be deciphered. But Hemchandra makes it a humorous document by introducing into it a long array of titled sycophants who are generally the ^{butt} ~~built~~ of ridicule in Indian Society. It is a piece of cheap raillery but sure to commend itself to the gallery or to ordinary readers. The list reads as follows :-

Mahamahima Māthāy Pālak Sir Mahārājāh Muluk -fakkā (The Honourable Sir Mahārājāh Lack -land with feathers in his turban) Jabardasta Saulot Bāhādur (The High and Mighty robbing Bāhādur), Mahāmānya Golām Gēdhādhā (The Right Honourable Slave and Ass), Rājāh Bāhādur Chēnda dōhandā (Rājāh Bāhādur Subscription-payer), Rāy Bāhādur Jay-Jaykār (Rāy Bāhādur the Singer of Government's glory), Rāy Bāhādur Chālāk - Chōsta (Rāy Bāhādur the 'outast' of Sharpers), Mīrmurdā Huzur Thāndā (Mīrmurdā the expert at humouring his master), Khān Bāhādur Khapar dōhendā (Khān Bāhādur the Informer), Honourable Hāzir Bandā (the heens Honor Honourable slave on attendance) etc., etc. Old Lady Cepulet, Juliet's grandmother, is another additional character. She is kept alive for the purpose of Scene III, Act I, in which she takes the place of Juliet's mother. This change is introduced in order to make the situation acceptable to Indian taste. A girl would be thought impertinent expressing her views on ~~the~~ marriage and allied subjects before her parents. There is more friendly relation in Indian society between a grand-mother and a grand-daughter and freedom of speech and unrestricted exchange of thoughts and sentiments are more natural in their intercourse. The nurse is of course present in the scene and her humours are well preserved

except in such indelicate passages as "Yea" quoth he, "dost thou fall upon thy face? Thou wilt fall backward when thou hast more wit; wilt thou not, Juliet?" or "No less! Nay, bigger; women grow by men", which are omitted. A number of young ladies Sohee, Sutar, Subhash, Tariddamini, Nishijamini, relations of the Kapulats are added to give verisimilitude to the party and the picture that is drawn of the ladies' drawing room in Scene V. Act I, is characteristically Indian in the small talk about the latest vogue in dress and ornaments in which the guests are engaged. It is intended as a fling at modern ^{^ women} of India which is very likely to be appreciated by the gallery. Even the names of these ladies are ultra-modern. This scene ends with the entrance of Ramoo and his friends disguised as yellow-robed singing and playing religious mendicants (Baul). Here is an innovation - for in the original they enter the house of Capulet putting on masks ready for the masked ball. This ball has got to be omitted in the adaptation and this device is adopted for the reason that such bands of travelling mendicants have free access in any house and to any parts of it and they often come and entertain parties. ~~Yashodhar~~ Hemchandra is put to some shift in order to bring about the first meeting of Ramoo and Juliet as men and women guests are kept in separate drawing rooms in deference to the established usage of the country. He devises a verandah connecting the inner and outer apartments of the building where the guests are accommodated. All these apartments open on a common courtyard where the dancing of the company of the Bauls and other

gaieties will take place and which will thus be equally witnessed by the ladies and the gentlemen present. It is in this connecting passage that Romeo waits in the hope of meeting Juliet and descends on her beauty. He does not, as in the original, walk up to her "place of stand", and accost her for they are not in the same apartment. The meeting ultimately takes place here. Another difficulty of a serious nature which he has to get over is regarding the burial of Juliet in the family vault after her supposed death. Indian customs would not allow burial and will demand cremation. But the cremation of her dead body will materially affect the subsequent events and the latter portion of the drama will have to be entirely re-written. To avoid these complications he invokes the aid of the holy Sastras and in the directions which Mathurananda Swami (Priest Laureate) gives to Juliet for the use of the "death—counterfeiting liquor" he makes it plain that as it will be regarded as a case of suicide, the customary rite of cremating the dead body will not take place and the corpse will be placed before the temple of Lakshmi Narayanji in the crematorium and will be exposed there for half a day before being finally disposed of. During that interval efforts will be made to revive her. "The Sastras forbid the cremation of the body of a suicide" (Ātma-ghātī dahīr satkār nisiddha śāstrar mate, Act IV, Sc II) thus he declares. In Act III, Sc 1, after the death of Tybalt the prince accompanied by Montague, Capulet and their wives appear on the scene. Hamchandra does not allow the ladies to appear and Lady Capulet's accusing speech is put into the mouth of Capulet. In the same Act, Scene II, Juliet's speech is denuded of all in-delicacy

suggestions which hardly consist with the proper modesty of a maiden. For example, the following lines are not rendered.

" Lovers can see to do their amorous rites
By their own beauties; or, if love be blind,
It best agrees with night XXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
And learn me how to lose a winning match,
Play'd for a pair of stainless maidenhoods ."

In Act IV, Sc I Paris and Juliet meet in Frier Laurence's cell but this meeting is omitted by Hemchandre as inconsistent with Indian customs which place a restriction on the free mixing of the sexes. Juliet is alone there consulting the Ascetic Mathurenanda for a way out of her difficulties. In the scene corresponding to Scene V, Act IV in the original where Frier Laurence and Paris enter accompanied by musicians, we have in place of the musicians, a company of Peres's attendants bearing presents for the bride- a very realistic Indian touch. Similarly a very realistic touch is supplied where Romeo is made to buy his poison from a female pipsy gipsy and not from a poor apothecary that abuses his profession; for these gipsies have a notoriety for dealing in deadly poisons. In rendering Scene IV, Act II many changes have been necessary. It is very difficult to retain Shakespearian humour of a passage like this and then to make it intelligible to those who are unacquainted with English. Entirely new humour has been substituted for this. The speech of Mercutio "without hisroe, like a dried herring etc," with allusions to Petrarch's Laura, to Dido, Cleopatra, Helen,

Here, *Thisbe*, has to be recast and is recast. *Vidyapati*, the great poet of love and his ladylove *Rasmi Rani* are introduced and such famous beauties sung of in a hundred poems and stories as *Padmini*, *Lakschire*, *Vidya*, *Murjahan* are very aptly and gracefully brought in. Instead of a French~~n~~ salutation to Frenchified *Romeo* which would be meaningless and pointless, there is an English salutation to Anglicised *Romeo* which would be understood and humo/rously received. Similarly the subsequent fooling with the nurse is something new, not to be found in the original - carefully cooked to Indian taste. It is to be noticed that anything with the slightest odour of indelicacy about it is rigorously excluded.

Even in that successful prose translation in Marathi of the same play, *Premacha Kelasa*, certain changes and omissions on the ground of unintelligibility have been deemed necessary. In Act II, Sc IV *Marcutio's* dissertation on duelling and his somewhat liberal use of technical terms would certainly prove disconcerting to an Indian reader. Hence, they are very wisely transformed into familiar terms of Indian wrestling. Again, the verbal passage-at-arms between *Romeo* and *Mercutio* that almost directly follows the above, the bandying of words, can hardly be translated. *Hemchandra*, we have seen, has substituted something new for them and the same has been done in this translation.

In *Rudrasena*, another successful version of Shakespeare which is according to the author a translation of *Othello*, similarly all the characters are made Indian and the scene is laid in India, and such changes as are demanded by these alterations are freely ~~int~~ introduced. *Othello* is named

Rudra Sena and Desdemona becomes Chandravati. Iago is Govindprasad and his wife Emilia is Amala. Cassio is Keshava and Bianca Menska. Brabantio is Vahkravahana and so on. The scene is partly at Bikan~~ir~~ and partly at Achalgar. There is not any additional character. It is to be noticed that all indelicate and unsavoury passages such as the two of Iago's speeches in Act II, Sc. 1, "Zounds; Sir, you are robbed, etc." and "Zounds! Sir, you are one that will not serve Godde", II 392-394 - Act I, Sc III, II 396-397 - Act III Sc. III, II 403-406 in the same scene are either changed or omitted. A considerable portion of the first scene in Act II is omitted as inconsistent with Indian customs. Desdemona (Chandravati) is not allowed to address Othello (Rudra-Sena) as "My dear Othello" (I 186) as the Indian wife is forbidden to address her husband by name. Desdemona (Chandravati) and Cassio (Keshava) are not allowed to shake hands on which "Puddling with ^{the} palm" Iago builds his theory of "lechery" to fool Roderigo (Raghunath). Iago reads and interprets in accordance with the perversity of his mind the speechless messages of their eyes at meeting. The beautiful "willow" song that Desdemona sings in Scene III, Act IV could not be retained for the willow has no literary or other associations in an Indian's mind and in its place there is a song about a faded garland of Bekula flowers woven with love's care, tended with wept tears, for the beloved who is gone from her, perhaps not to come back in this life. There is also a change in the manner of Desdemona's death for which it is rather difficult to account. In Shakespeare Othello smothers her to death but here she is struck dead by his sword. The

same innovation is to be found in another adaptation of Othello, Bhimsingha (1875) by Tarinicharan Pal. Perhaps the barbarity of the former method of killing her was considered too shocking. In a Marathi adaptation of the same play *Janjare Rava Nataka* similarly the song of "Willow" is replaced by a song celebrating the story of an unhappy princess young and beautiful, chaste and wise, never lacking in love and devotion to her husband, yet cruelly treated by him. Sometimes these changes are unnecessarily made. An example of this occurs in "Bhimsingha" mentioned above, In Act II, Sc. III in which Cassio (Chandranath) is plied with wine and heated beyond selfcontrol, wine is replaced by Siddhi, a kind of hemp smoked by common people, and in place of Iago's (Bhairav Singha) song "Let me the canakin clink, clink etc." "We have a song in praise of this highly deleterious smoke. It cannot be said that wine was an unknown form of intoxication in India and the change was needed. It, however, effects a not unreasonable change in the scene on the seashore of Cyprus where Cassio meets Desdemona (Svarnalata) waiting for the safe arrival of Othello's ship and they shake hands, stop aside and talk together on which Iago's lecherous deductions are made. Cassio (Chandranath) is not allowed to show so much familiarity; he is merely permitted to make a present of flowers to her as the wife of his chief and this is enough for Iago's (Bhairav singha) scheming brain.

"Tamalini" a Bengali version of the Winter's Tale has already been mentioned. It is a very creditable production and its merits will be discussed in their proper place. It is

really a translation with the names of the dramatic personae changed and such alterations introduced as are necessitated by the Indian setting and atmosphere. Two of these were mentioned before viz that Polixenes (Ajitsingha) is not ~~not~~ only a friend of Leontes (Nikhata - King of Malwa) but also a very near relation and that Paulina (Malina) the widow of Antigonus (Davedas) is not allowed to marry Camillo (Satyavrata) as Indian customs do not permit the remarriage of widows. Over and above these, notice the following alterations. In Act IV, Sc. III, Florizel's speech - "Apprehend nothing but jollity etc." is full of classical instances of gods "humbling their deities to love"; Jupiter, Neptune, Golden Apollo are mentioned as demeaning themselves in pursuit of love. These allusions to well-known fables are replaced by a story of Indra and other gods who came down from heaven, assumed human shapes and attended the assembly of the Princes from whom the famous beauty Damayanti was choosing her husband. In the same scene the precious flowers and herbs, such as hot lavender, mints, ~~sage~~ savory, marjorems, the marigold, which Perdita presents to the guests at the sheepshearing feast, are all replaced by Indian flowers such as Gandherāj, Mallikē, Mālātī, Golāb, Champak, Sata, Bakul, Chāmelī, Kūminī, Rajanīgandhā, the golden Suryyamukhi and "the flowers O' the spring" for which she wishes are not those that "frighted Proserpina let fall from Dis's waggon" - daffodils, dim violets, pale primo-roses that die unmarried, bold oxlips and lil-ies of all kinds, but they are the celestial Parijais a garland of which the

Queen of heaven let fall in the Nandana garden frightened by the Asuras, the blue and open-eyed Aparajita, the fragile Shefalika that dies un-married before being kissed by the sun, Tamal, Kunda, and lotuses of all kinds. Autolycus in the original vends lawn "white as driven snow, cyprus black, gloves, masks for faces and noses, bracelets, necklaces, perfume, golden quoifs and stomachers, pins etc., for most of which Indian maids and lasses shall not have any use. In the adaptation he (Jaggi) deals in such wares as are familiar to them and as are likely to capture their fancy. They are mostly saris of different kinds, textures, colours "white as whipped cream", deepblue", "filmy" "with broad prominent central stripes", also bracelets, ribbons and combs for the hair, tinsals, perfume, red-point for the feet, silk handkerchiefs, nets for the hair etc. etc.. In "Madan Manjari" another Bengali adaptation of the Winter's Tale (1876) and Sangit Samsaya Samsrama Nataka, a Marathi adaptation, the characters are similarly all Indian. These two adaptations retain very little of Shakespeare except the story and show strong influences of the Sanskrit drama. Paulina (Gunashila in the first, Dakshayani in the second) is, however, not allowed to remarry in either.

Instances of such modifications of Shakespearian thoughts, sentiments, situations, foreign imageries, classical allusions, poetic conceits, as a concession to the demands of Indian taste Indian atmosphere and setting introduced, abound in all these adaptations and also in such translations as substitute Indian characters for foreign characters. Thus in a Bengali adaptation of Hamlet called Amarsingha (1874) in Act II, Sc II,

where Polonius introduces the actors to Hamlet, the passage suffers a good deal of curtailment on account of its extreme allusiveness and Hamlet's invocation in feigned madness of Japheth, judge of Israel, is turned into a reference to Kenva and his fair daughter sekuntala. Next for the story of Priam's slaughter at the hands of rugged Pyrrhus^{^r} and the consequent grief of the widowed queen which is recited to Hamlet by the players, we have Rati's (Goddess of Love) lament over the death of Madan (God of Love) who was burnt and reduced to ashes by the fire of Hara's (God of destruction) rage. In Act III, Sc II, in Hamlet's (Amarsingha) directions to the players advantage is taken of the situation to introduce a diatribe against the actors in Yatra, a very popular and crude form of dramatic entertainment in Bengal. In Act IV, Sc V, Ophelia's (Sarojini) madness is no doubt very weakly reproduced but no attempt is made to render such indelicate songs as "To morrow is Saint Valentine's Day" etc., or "By Gis and by saint Charity." The scene of Gravediggers (Sc I, Act V.) is as a matter of course omitted and nothing is substituted in its place. It may be remarked by the way that this omission leaves a distinct sense of void in the mind when we go through this adaptation though the propriety of this scene, as hardly in keeping with the tragic spirit of the play, has been many times called in question. In a Bengali adaptation of the Comedy of Errors named Bhramajala Kautuka (1873) an additional character Madan, a brother to Padmavati (Adriana) is introduced in order to get over the difficulty of Purdah. Padmavati as a Zenana lady could not without impropriety go out in the street in pursuit of her husband Vasentakumar

(younger Antipholus) and accuse him before the King. This is done for her by her brother Madan. The same difficulty does not arise in the case of Mayavati (Aemilia) for as an ascetic woman she enjoys the privilege of appearing in public and before the King. In a Hindi adaptation of the same play *Bhramajale Natak* (1879) which makes the farce coarser by the introduction of some unnecessary new characters of a low type, there is a topical touch added by a modern law court scene over which a *Munsiff*, an officer of subordinate rank, presides and before whom the smith sues younger Jagaddatta (younger Antipholus) for the recovery of the price of the necklace supplied to him. The *Munsiff* and his clerk are depicted as demanding a bribe from the unhappy plaintiff.

In *Rudrapal Natak* (1874), a Bengali adaptation of *Macbeth*, in the introductory scene in place of the three witches we have three *Bhairavis* - female worshippers of the *Trenta* cult generally associated with revolting and gruesome practices. They are made to appear on the *hazir* in the first instance and in the second, they appear in a cremation ground, which is their favourite haunt and *Rudrapal* (*Macbeth*) meets them as he happens to pass the place thereon his way. In Act I, Sc. V Lady *Macbeth's* (*Chaturika*) soliloquy " O'lamis thou art, and Caudor; and shall be/ What thou art promised ; etc." occasioned by the reading of *Macbeth's* letter is followed by the entrance of a messenger bearing the tidings of the King's imminent visit. This messenger in the adaptation is a female for the male messenger

cannot get access to a lady. Before Suryyapal (~~present~~) (Duncan) enters the palace of Rudrapal (Macbeth) he is met with by a number of ominous portents such as a lamp suddenly rising, owls screeching, unexpected tripping on the doorstep etc., all in consonance with popular Indian superstition. Special difficulty is encountered by the adapter in the banquet scene (Act III, Sc IV.) According to Indian custom Lady Macbeth is absent from it but keeps herself near the room of state behind a screen and commands a view of the hall. When the appearance of the ghost throws Rudrapal into fits and the nobles, alarmed at his unusual behaviour make for departure, she intervenes by means of messages sent through servants from her inner apartment. When it is at last found that the ghost will not leave persecuting and unnerving Rudrapal, she sends word that she will have to be with her lord — and the hint is taken and the uneasy guests leave the banquet hall. This clumsy device spoils the whole effect of the scene which is calculated to bring out the superb strength of Lady Macbeth's character. Corresponding to Sc V, Act III in the original, we have a scene in which the three Bhairavis appear and along with them a male worshipper of the Tentric cult who practises his austerities sitting on a corpse and he, at the bidding of the three foul sisters, raises three spirits and commissions them to fetch the following three articles for the success of their diabolical charm. They are (1) three hairs from the matted locks of God Mahadeva now hidden in a dark cavern; (2) the blood of a sacrificed buffalo; (3) a little of the

earth from the ground on which Ravana, the King of the demons, was cremated. The next scene of witchcraft, in which the four apparitions appear and reveal the future to Macbeth and warn him, is presided over in the adaptation by these three Bhairavis and in place of four, we have 6 apparitions the first three of which are merely meant to frighten Rudrapal and the verses of incantation are such as are used in Tantric rites e.g. "Energy, energy is the root of all things Out of it come both the physical and astral bodies etc." In the sleepwalking scene, (Act IV, Sc. 1) "All the perfumes of Arabia" that will fail to sweeten Lady Macbeth's hand are changed into "all the sandal from the Malaya mountains".

In the adaptations of *Cymbeline* e.g. Bengali *Sushila-Virasingha* (1868) and Marathi *Tara-Nataka* (1879), ^{the} ~~the~~ queen could not be depicted as a widow remarried to the King. Hence (Bhimakatu in the first, Marara Rava in the second) could not be a son to the queen by a former husband. In the first he is a cousin to the queen, in the second a nephew. When Imogen (Sushila in the first adaptation) falls into a deathlike trance in the assumed character of Fidele (Shashindra) and the dead body has to be disposed of, there cannot be a burial and the Bengali adaptation is faced by a difficulty. It is got over by the help of a reluctance on the part of Mahendra and Bhupendra (Guidarius and Arviragus) to reduce to ashes such a lovely figure and thus the dead body is left by them covered with flowers on the place where their nurse Euriphila was cremated. In the scene, in the Marathi adaptation, corresponding to scene IV, Act III in

the original where Iachimo (Khanluji in the Marathi adaptation) describes to Posthumus (Hamvira Rava) Imogen's (Tarabai) bedchamber, the stories of proud Cleopatra, chaste Dian etc. figured in the hanging tapestry of the room and elsewhere are changed into a picture of God Vishnu lying fully stretched on the padai ocean. From his navel shoots up a long -stalked lotus in the centre of which is seated the four-headed god Brahma with the four Vedas in his hands; his heavenly spouse the Goddess Laksmi is seated at his feet and Garuda his feathered votary is kneeling at a distance with hands clasped in prayer. There is also a representation of Sita in the Asoka forest in dead Lanka seated under an Asoka tree, pining away for grief at the forcible separation from Ramachandra. Hanuman who has treaced her there is sitting on a branch of the tree looking tearfully on her unavailing sorrows. The first scene in Act III in the adaptation takes place in the private apartment of the Queen between herself and the King alone in which she tutors him for the coming interview with Vijaya Singha (Caius Lucius). In the scene following takes place the Durbar in which he receives in audience Vijaya Singha and from which public function the queen is absent according to the custom of the country. In Act 5, Sc. IV, in place of god Jupiter, God Mahadeva in one version and god Vishnu in another appear in Posthumus's dream.

In Ramachandra's adaptation of The Tempest (Nalini-Vasanta) the masque in Act IV, Sc I, representing Iris, Ceres, Juno has been changed into a representation of Laksmi

the goddess of wealth (corresponding to Ceres), *Chhapala* (lit. lightning, corresponding to Iris) and *Sachi* the queen of Indra, the king of the gods (corresponding to Juno). In a Marathi translation of the same play by Nilkantha Jnanardan Kirtane (1875) the names of these goddesses are retained in an Indianised form such as Iris, *Siris*, Juno but their functions are also described and when any of them has a counterpart in an Indian divinity, that divinity is mentioned. Thus Iris is described as the goddess of the rainbow, Ceres as the goddess of the fields and Juno as *Indrani* (i.e. the queen of Indra).

The difficulties of adaptations and the extent of changes necessitated by the introduction of Indian atmosphere and Indian dramatic personae will be made very clear from a Bengali adaptation of *Measure for Measure* (Vinimaya 1909, by Virendra Nath Roy). This play offers tremendous difficulties in its situations which are almost impossible in the eyes of an Indian. For example, it is impossible to depict any girl (like Juliet) being with child before marriage, or any woman (like Mariana) yielding her body to her faithless lover in the hope of obtaining him as her husband. There is nothing unnatural in the lust of Angelo which can very well be retained. But the two situations above mentioned in which the play turns a good deal are impossible of presentation in India. Thus both of them are altered in the adaptation. In the first, *Karnasinha* (Claudio) elopes with *Surama* (Juliet) and for this offence he is condemned to death by *Tajsingha* (Angelo) who secretly

longs to marry her. In the second, Keruna (Meriana) is married to Tajsingha who, after falsely accusing her of faithlessness, refuses to live with her. Mistress Overdone, Pompey, Lucius and company with their filth of language and bawdry associations are as a matter of course excluded. Some new characters as the eye-royal priest and the dowager queen (the Duke's mother) are added. The work thus undergoes a wholesale change and except for the story in its main outlines there is very little of Shakespeare in it. Tajsingha (Angelo) is more diabolical in it than in Shakespeare. He is a villain disguised as a saint, full of dark and treacherous thoughts, working his way up through sheer crookedness. There is no sudden fall as in the case of Angelo. Everything is deliberate, carefully planned and thought out. The play is also given a new name Vinimaya which means exchange i.e. exchange of love ~~as as~~ that Mohini (Isabelle) makes with Menasendra (the Duke) for ~~his~~ his saving the life of her brother Kernasingha (Claudio) in the disguise of a Parivrajaka (friar).

Examples of such ~~addition~~ additions and alterations in Shakesperian adaptations can be multiplied but it is hoped that enough has been said to indicate their nature and also to show the difficulty of the task which these adapters have laid upon themselves. It was previously remarked that the work of adaptation was more simple and less exacting than the work of translation and hence it was that in India the number of Shakesperian adaptations exceeded the number of translations. But the statement must be received with a certain amount

of qualification. There are adaptations and adaptations, as there are translations and translations. Of course an adaptation permits all kinds of liberties with the original which a translation hardly allows and often an easy way out of a difficulty will be found in the former which does not ~~exit~~ exist in the latter. But a conscientious performance of either kind is equally arduous. An adaptation of the Jehanara type (a Bengali adaptation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* 1904 - by Satishchandra Chattopadhyay), the Hindi Bhramajale type, or some of the Sangeit adaptations of Shakespeare in Marathi cost very little in pains and skill. The main incidents of Shakespeare's plays are followed in them, but his inimitable thoughts and sentiments, his poetry and music - in fact all that matters in him we sorrowfully miss. These are new productions on Shakespearian themes and for the most part crude imitations. Such adaptations do not represent the best that could be done. Such adaptations as Hemchandra advocated and has achieved in *Romeo and Juliet* and *Nalini-Vasanta* hardly differ from translations; for all that is best in Shakespeare is reproduced and though it has not been possible to preserve the poetry and music of Shakespeare's original, his blank verses supply as near a substitute as could possibly be devised in the alien medium of Bengali and are thoroughly satisfying to the ears of his countrymen. Adaptations of this latter kind are very rare. Mostly they are in prose, in some cases in prose and verse mixed as in the Sangeit type in Marathi and in some Bengali versions, with additions and alterations in thoughts, sentiments, situations as

above indicated and with Shakespeare ~~po~~red, pruned, curtailed and abbreviated at sweet will. Some of the changes which are introduced seem hardly called for and warranted. For instance, all the changes in ~~situ~~^{ac}ations inserted in deference to the custom of restricted intercourse between the sexes that obtains at the present day in India are hardly necessary; for this necessity can be very well avoided by placing the incidents in India's past when greater freedom was enjoyed in this respect. In the historical plays in modern vernaculars, which are generally based on past incidents of Indian history, no such restriction is observed and ladies are even depicted as fighting on the field against the foes of their country. This does not seem to shock the audience as such plays are enormously ^{popular} on the Indian stage. In a Marathi adaptation of King Lear (Atipide Raja), Atipide Raja is needlessly saddled with the mombries of three wives all of whom are dead and to each of whom each of the three daughters Sheshikale (Goneril), Chandrenana (Regan), Mr/gankamala (Cordelia) was respectively born. In an adaptation of As You Like It in the same language (Sangit Pramgumpha), all possible changes demanded by Indian conditions are made. Such minute alterations as "Gergentae's mouth" (1239, Act III, Sc II) replaced by the ten mouths of Ravane, "Jove's tree" (1251) by Kalpe tree (a legendary wishing tree) are carried out. But in Act IV, Sc II, Jacques's song about the horn is retained and translated. The horn has no special significance in Indian literatures which it has in English. So the point which it has to serve and which is rather indelicate is entirely lost to such readers as are ignorant of English literature. Even in

such a professed translation as Marathi Raghunath Rave (Henry VIII), the song about Orpheus in Act III, Sc. I is changed into a song about Narada Muni who is credited in Indian legends with wielding identical powers over inanimate nature with his lute. This introduction of Narada Muni which is done to help Indian comprehension hardly accords with the general atmosphere of the play in which as a strict translation all outlandish foreign customs are retained. Merely the displacement of foreign names of the dramatic personae by Indian names will not induce an atmosphere favourable to the insertion of an Indian fable. Further on, in the last scene of the last act, in rendering Cromwell's prophecy regarding Elizabeth, the legend of "The Bird of Wonder", the phoenix is kept intact and it is difficult to see why this should be better understood in India than the allusion to Orpheus.

The above are some examples of unnecessary changes, anachronistic and other kinds of senseless oddities perpetrated in the course of an attempt to make Shakespeare acceptable to Indian taste and intelligible to Indian comprehension.

The translations of Shakespeare as we possess them are hardly of a superior order. They are generally rendered ~~verses~~ rendered in prose and thus one of the most essential features of Shakespeare's dramas viz: the majesty of their verse, their poetry and music are at once lost. In them no change is effected either in respect of the names of the

dramatic personae, of the scenes of action, or of thoughts, sentiments, customs, manners. The attempt is made to make it as literal as possible and to carry as much of Shakespeare's meaning as the language of translation can possibly do.

Some translations are so literal that they do great violence to the genius of the language employed and are hardly intelligible to those who are not acquainted with the original Shakespeares. Such a translation of Macbeth exists in bengal, published in 1875 by Taraknath Mukhopadhyay. In the preface he assures us that he has produced his work after laboriously consulting many commentaries and this is borne out by an enormous quantity of footnotes he has added in every page. Examples from this work will be given in the proper place. It will suffice here to say that it is a typical production showing how a literal translation can be made perfectly unintelligible. The only word that can be said in its favour is that it might prove of some assistance to a student who is going through the original Macbeth. All prose translations are not necessarily of this poor kind. Some of the Hindi translations or Marathi translations are literal and at the same time chaste and idiomatic. Still they, in the words of Sir Edwin Arnold again, "Cannot reproduce the character of Shakespeare's majestic verse, nor give more than the general meaning of his play..... They may prove of considerable service to a Hindu student reading the play, who will of-ten be assisted towards better comprehension of the English text by the simple exposition which is therein afforded." It is only in rare cases that they can command

attention for independent literary worth of their own and can be trusted as even safe substitute for Shakespeare.

In Bengal alone a few attempts have been made to translate Shakespeare wholly in verse and prose as they appear in the original text. The reason for this is that Bengal, very early in the history of its modern literature, developed a kind of blank verse in imitation of the English measure, which has been used with great effect in such translations. The blank verse which is associated with the

immortal name of the great Bengali poet

Michael Madhusudan Datta - its inventor and its matchless wielder in his celebrated *épics* - has now a recognised position in Bengali literature and is a very common and powerful instrument of poetic expression. Two such poetical translations, *Macbeth* by the great actor-dramatist Girish Chandra Ghosh and *Julius Caesar* by Jyotirindra Nath Tagore, a brother of Sir Rabindra Nath Tagore and a name of great eminence in Bengali letters, are unqualified successes. To these may be added the two adaptations - only technically so but really translations - by the great poet Homchandra, an adaptation of *Othello* called *Rudra Sena* by another eminent literary man Nilimal Bandopadhyaya and an adaptation of *the Winter's Tale* under the name of *Tamalini* by Dhanada Charan Mitra. Two other attempts of less successful kind in the direction of poetical translations are a translation of *King Lear* by Jatindra Mohan Ghosh and *The Tempest* by Nagendra Prosad Sarvedhicary. We shall have occasion to

speck of these later and in greater details.

In our analysis of these Indian versions of Shakespeare we have seen that so far only 25 plays have been attempted to be rendered. We have excluded from this list the Indian versions in narrative prose of the stories of Shakespearian plays. The plays thus adapted or translated are *The Tempest*, *The two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Measure for Measure*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *Much Ado about Nothing*, *Love's Labour Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *As you Like it*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *All's Well That Ends Well*, *Twelfth Night*, *The Winter's Tale*, *King Richard III*, *King Henry VIII*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Othello*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Cymbeline*, *Pericles*. It will be noticed that this list contains 19 out of the 20 plays chosen for treatment by Charles and Mary Lamb, the one to be left out being *Timon of Athens*. The six additional plays which do not occur in Lamb's tales but are included in the Indian list are *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Love's Labour Lost*, *King Richard III*, *King Henry VIII*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Julius Caesar*. It will be interesting to note that four out of these six plays have only an Indian version each and in one Indian language alone. Thus there are a Marathi version of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, a Hindustani version of "*Love's Labour Lost*", a Marathi version of *King Henry VIII* and one Marathi version of *Antony and Cleopatra*. As regards the remaining two, *Julius Caesar* and *King Richard III*,

there are three versions of the former but only in two languages. These are one bengali version and two rendering in Marathi of Julius Caesar. The latter -Richard III- has only two versions in two languages viz : Hindustani and Marathi. It is obvious from the above that these six plays after all play an insignificant part in the history of India's Shakesperian versions. It is therefore very difficult to escape the suspicion that in the matter of selecting Shakespeare's plays for purposes of adaptations and translations, Indian authors have been largely influenced by the choice shown by the Lembs, and when we remember that a translation of their tales from Shakespeare first introduced him in-to Indian literature, the inference does not seem to be wholly without foundation. Of course there are other factors which have gone into this preference shown for certain plays and exclusion of others. The most potent of these has been the need for adaptation embracing such comprehensive changes as begin from the names of the dramatic personae and extend over anything foreign in thoughts sentiments, situations, imageries etc. As regards the historical plays, which, as a rule, have been excluded from the scope of Indian versions, the need for ~~for~~ their avoidance in such a scheme will be apparent. The characters in such plays are all well known historical figures and the situations and incidents are mainly historical. To change the first and to depart grossly from the latter takes much away from their value. Take, for example, the Indian version of the famous history of King Henry VIII who is Raja Raghunatha Raya. It has not been possible for the

translator to change such pivotal incidents as the fact of Katharine's (Queen Padmavati) being the widow of Henry's brother subsequently married to him and the divorce which follows on the ground of the illegality of such a marriage. Both these incidents are distasteful to Indian taste, but if altered, the entire framework of the play will collapse; and when - such conspicuous personages of English history as Henry VIII, Cardinal Wolsey, Cranmer, Anna Bullen are turned into such fictitious and unreal Indian personages as Rājā Raghunāth Rāva, Guṇḍāchārya, Śrīnivāsāchārya, Padmavati, Padmini, the incidents and the situations of their lives which form the subject matter of dramatic action become wholly insipid and lifeless. The prophecy regarding the future of Anna Bullen's infant daughter who is the future mighty Queen Boss of England, when transferred to the imaginary daughter of an imaginary Queen like Padmini loses all its force and appeal in an atmosphere of unreality and incredulity that it creates. The same experience one has in reading the adaptation of King Richard III called Jayaji Rava Nataka. All the characters and their actions seem unreal and it seems as if we are "moving in a world not realised". The characters being Indianised and thus turned into fanciful beings are unrooted in this earth of ours and the monstrosities of Richard's character uncorroborated by history seem to be the figments of an overheated imagination. There are improvements made here and there to suit Indian taste and these sometimes make matters worse. Take, for example, the scene of Richard's tempestuous wooing of Lady Anne. Richard, the murderer of

her husband and her father-in-law, descends on her as a hurricane while she is in her bitterest mood and completely sweeps her off her feet into his arms by sheer devilry and dissembling. "Was ever woman in this humour woo'd ? Was ever woman in in this humour won ?". This exalting note of that diabolical character will lose more than half its triumphant ring, and the conquest of Anne in such a hurricane of love-making will miss half its intensity if she is not recently widowed and her woeer the cause of it. In the adaptation she cannot be a widow and she is not and the malignant attraction of Richard's deformed figure and diabolical mind is nearly ruined. It is a sad spectacle to see how these historical characters cut adrift from their historical moorings flounder and totter on the verge of wreck. The same remarks apply to a Marathi adaptation of Julius Caesar who is Vijeja-singhe in the Indian version. An oppressive atmosphere of unreal-ity hangs about it and stifles all interest. An instructive contrast it forms with a translation of the same play in Bengali where, not being divorced from their historical background, the world-figures of Julius Caesar, Brutus and Mark Antony seem clothed in flesh and blood and not fleeting shadows.

It seems, therefore, that it is not merely the example of Lamb which has been followed in keeping clear of the historical plays, but it has also been dictated to a great extent by good sense. Adaptations of these plays are bound to be \pm uninteresting and as long as India is not prepared to welcome Shakesperian translations without any

violent modifications except what little is necessary to suit the genius of the different languages, they had better be left alone.

The above remarks are more or less applicable to Titus Andronicus, Coriolanus and Troilus and Cressid to render which no attempt has yet been made in India. In them the characters have either historical or legendary significance. Over and above this, Lamb has not included them in his tales. It is difficult to see why Timon of Athens which Lamb has not discarded has come out of his twenty selections failed to receive recognition in India. Its very bitter and appalling misanthropy which is against the grain of the Indian mind might be one of the causes of its being found unattractive. Doubt as regards its genuineness as a Shakesperian production might have also contributed towards this result.

It also appears from an analysis of these Indian versions of Shakespere that of the twenty five plays so far attempted all are not equally popular. It was stated that these versions spread over as many as ten different Indian languages. With "The Merry Wives of Windsor - Love's Labour Lost - King Henry VIII - Antony and Cleopatra already mentioned, Much Ado - About - Nothing and "Pericles" occupy the lowest rung having one version each in a single language. Just above these are the Two Gentleman of Verona Twelfth Night, Julius Caesar, Richard III and the Teming of the Shrow claiming only two languages each. Measure for Measure, All's Well That Ends Well, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Winter's Tale, Macbeth and Hamlet

each claim three languages. As you Like It reaches half the number. Next The Comedy of Errors, Cymbeline and King Lear each claim six languages. Romeo and Juliet reaches the figure 7. At the top are The Merchant of Venice and Othello each rendered in as many as 9 languages.

If we take into consideration the number of versions each play has undergone, The Merchant of Venice comes out at the top with 17 such versions. Romeo and Juliet and Othello both form a good second with 15 versions each. The number next drops to 10 in the case of The Comedy of Errors, 9 in the case of Hamlet, 8 in the case of King Lear and Cymbeline and 7 in the case of The Tempest. In the case of the rest it varies between 5 and 1.

It appears to us rather risky to draw any general conclusion from the above facts such as measuring the degree of fascination a particular play has for the Indian mind either by the number of languages in which it has been rendered or by the number of renderings it has undergone. All Indian languages are not at the same stage of development and the attempt to render Shakespeare is very much conditioned by the progress a particular language has made in its evolution. Next a very successful translation or adaptation of a particular play in a particular language at a comparatively early stage of such attempts may inhibit further efforts as far as that play and that language are concerned. An example of this will be found in Bengal. After Namohendra's successful adaptation of Romeo and Juliet (1895) no one has yet had the boldness to take up

up a new version of the same play. Girish Chandra's *Macbeth* and Jatindra Nath's *Julius Caesar* have similarly put a limit to the number of the Bengali versions of these two plays.

Still, an attempt may be made, tentatively of course, to assess from the combined results of the two analyses given above the popularity which is enjoyed by some of the Shakesperian plays. The method we follow is that we take in order of precedence from the first list all the plays which have reached up to half or nearly half the number of the Indian languages in which Shakesperian versions are to be found. Next, we take from the second list in the same order all the plays which have reached up to the half or nearly the half of the number of versions which the topmost one has reached. They will arrange themselves as follows:-

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. The Merchant of Venice | 1. The Merchant of Venice |
| 2. Othello. | 2. Othello |
| 3. Romeo and Juliet | 3. Romeo and Juliet. |
| 4. The Comedy of Errors | 4. The Comedy of Errors. |
| 5. Cymbeline | 5. <u>Hamlet.</u> |
| 6. King Lear | 6. Cymbeline. |
| 7. <u>As you Like it.</u> | 7. King Lear |
| 8. The Tempest. | 8. The Tempest. |

It will be interesting to note that there are eight plays in each column and as many as seven of them are common. As regards the eighth, *allegiance*, if it may be interpreted as such, is divided between *As you Like it* and

"Hamlet". There cannot be any doubt as to the extreme degree of popularity which is enjoyed by the first three viz: The Merchant of Venice, "Othello" and Romeo and Juliet. The appeal of the first two lies / to a great extent in the two oriental figures in them, however introduced in one and in the case of "The Merchant of Venice" the way in which justice is dealt out to Shylock is almost oriental in its acivete. Over and above this, there is a strong love-interest in both—it is predominatingly so in the case of Othello. We should remember at this stage what a prominent part the erotic sentiment plays in the Hindu conception of the drama. The strong ^{as} fascination which Romeo and Juliet has exercised over the Indian mind is entirely due to its dominating erotic sentiment. The story of these two youthful lovers constant like the fixed star, unswerving in the midst of all the opposing circumstances and of their marriage, in spite of its tragic ending, has a strong resemblance to a very popular Sanskrit play "Malati-Madhava" by Bhavabhuti where two young lovers are similarly opposed, are aided in their love by a holy woman, contract a secret marriage, and as the Indian drama must have it, triumph over all their difficulties and live happily ever afterwards. This likeness between the two plays must have contributed a good deal towards the popularity of Romeo and Juliet. It is difficult to see the special attraction of the "Comedy of Errors". There is, no doubt, an undercurrent of love in it but it is very mild. The farcical incidents that arise out of mistaken identity have their

parallels in current popular stories in India, but it seems to us that the fact^{that} it offers very little complexity in thoughts, sentiments or characterisation and thus lends itself easily to handling, has told in its favour. Cymbeline, As you Like it and The Tempest have all their appeal based primarily on this strong love-interest. It has already been seen that in the case of Cymbeline the story of the two Princes Guiderius and Arviragus living incognito forms a parallel to the story of the Princes Lava and Kusa in Uttara-Ramacarita. The hermit-like life of the banished Duke in the Forest of Arden, in As you Like It and the sage philosophy of life which he, Jacques and Amiens express have their special charm for the Indian mind. A passage like "All the World's a stage / And all the men and women merely players etc" is in perfect tune with the traditional Indian outlook on life and has a grip on the Indian mind all its own. It is the same philosophising of Prince Hamlet that specially draws India's heart to him, to which the subsidiary love episode with Ophelia lends an added interest. The magic wand of Prospero, we have seen, works similar wonders as we find in the performance of some of the magicians in Sanskrit dramas. Miranda furnishes a close parallel to the character of Sakuntala, the adopted daughter of the holy sage Kanva, brought up like Miranda, far away from the haunts of men in the seclusion of a hermitage, who, like her again, loses her heart to the first man she sees viz ; King Dasyanta. There is a very illuminating study of these two parallel characters

delineated by two immortal dramatists of the world- Shakes-
peares and Kalidasa- in the literary essays of sir Rabindra
Nath Tagore and the glamour which the character of Miranda
has for an Indian lies unfolded there in his inimitable
touches.

We conclude this chapter by again refer^{ing} to some
of the prefatory remarks appended to some of these trans-
lations and adaptations. In doing so, our object is to show
that not only has there^{been} an attempt to study Shakespeare
through the resemblance that undoubtedly exists between his
works and the classical productions of India^{and} and to
judge and appreciate his masterpieces by the standard of
taste laid down in Indian dramaturgical and rhetorical
treatises but there has also been an endeavour to seize
those essentially dramatic qualities which he ov^{er}flows so
abundantly in his writings and which really make for ~~his~~ his
unrivalled supremacy. This in a Marathi adaptation of The
Merchant of Venice - Strinayacaturyya (1871) the preface
runs as follows:- "The s^uperiority of Shakespeare's
plays as portraying human nature in its truest excellence,
unrivalled by any other dramatist, which has induced the
author of the following pages to attempt an adaptation into
Marathi of his comedy of The Merchant of Venice. ~~He~~-
He is aware that translations or adaptations of foreign
works lose much of the beauty of the original and that his
present attempt cannot be expected to have escaped this
defect especially when he has presumed to handle one of the
works of the Masterly Dramatist- _____" In a very

very short but pithy preface to his adaptation of Othello (Rudrasena), Manilal Bhandarkar writes, "Like all his other tragedies, Othello is a world poem; it is not written for a particular nation or for a particular country. The gradual unfolding of character, the various currents and cross-currents of human lives produced by clashing events, the very faithful pictures of the lights and shadows of our existence- which we meet with in this drama- are all true of our country as of all other countries."

CHAPTER II.

Interplay between the Shakesperian dramatic model and the ancient classic model of India. The ultimate triumph of shakespeare and his influence on the growth of the modern dramatic literature in Indian vernaculars. The modern Indian stage and its indebtedness to Shakespeare.

In the last chapter we studied some of the modifications which Shakespeare had undergone in Indian translations and adaptations in some of the Sanskritic languages. The modifications so far pointed out are in the nature of concessions to Indian taste and helps to Indian comprehension. Some of them are also necessitated by the peculiar genius of the medium employed for such purpose. In this chapter we propose to bring out an entirely new aspect of these modifications, to which we did not allude in our previous discussion. The reason for this reticence is that this aspect of the matter is fraught with such a high significance that its separate treatment was felt to be imperatively necessary. It reveals nothing less than a very interesting clash of two and in some respects different types of drama and through this conflict the survival of the fittest and its influence on the growth of a new dramatic literature.

This new dramatic literature is the modern drama of India as represented in some of the advanced vernaculars of the present day. Though the vernacular tongues of India are innumerable, very few of them have as yet a literature of any recognisable shape, not to speak of any dramatic literature.

Even among the ten languages in which Shakesperian translations and adaptations are to be found, very few possess any dramatic literatures worthy of recognition. Again, what dramatic literatures ^{are} ~~is~~ possessed by some of them have arisen in the same way, gone or are going through the same processes of evolution towards a type which is the same in every case. It is from the above considerations that we have been led to regard it as a homogeneous product and has dubbed it as the modern drama of India.

The modern vernacular literatures of India¹ in all their various departments may be regarded as the products of English education. It is true that most of them such as Bengali, Marathi, Gujrati, Hindustani (Urdu and Hindi), Punjabi, Tamil, Telugu each possess a literature of a kind dating from long before the advent of the English. For instance, in the case of Bengali, the oldest literary record, the song of Manik-chandra, according to Sir Grierson, dates from the days of the Buddhists. According to the same authority (c.f. His Linguistic survey of India) the beginning of the Marathi literature is to be found in the 13th century connected with the religious reformation started by Ramanuja ; the first Gujrati poet whose writings survive has been traced to the 15th century ; the oldest book in Punjabi dates from the 15th century ~~and~~ and so on. But it should be remembered that ~~that~~ these literatures are wholly poetical, mainly religious, occasionally containing bardic history and folk stories. As long as Sanskrit held the position of the common literary medium for the whole of India, these vernacular literatures were not very

seriously cultivated. Their only function seems to have been serving the needs of successive religious revivals that had gone on since the day of Sankaracharyya when, for their success, an appeal to the masses was imperatively demanded. By the time the English came to secure paramount power in India, Sanskrit had come to lose its dominance and English education opened the eyes of the people to the supreme necessity of developing the vernacular literatures.

Thus it will be evident that the modern dramatic literatures of India owes its birth to English education. As has been seen, the vernacular literatures of India (with perhaps the possible exception of Gujrati. In this connection C.P. Mr. H. H. Dhruva's article before the Oriental Congress in which he claims the existence of drama in Gujrati in pre-British days) did not possess any dramatic literature at the time and when the founding of such a literature came to be thought of, it is only natural that the influence of the English model, that is, the model of the accredited master of the English drama, Shakespeare, should exert itself. But it should not be forgotten that though there was no dramatic literature in the vernaculars of India, the Sanskrit drama was the common possession of India and it was impossible to keep eyes shut to it. There was no other dramatic tradition in India apart from that of the Sanskrit model. India at the time was the meeting ground of three cultures - the Hindu culture as expressed in the treasures of the Sanskrit literature, Traavidian culture in the South preserved in the ancient vernacular languages Tamil, Telugu but powerfully influenced

¹ "The Rise of the Drama in Modern India" by H.H. Dhruva in The Transactions of the 9th International Congress of Orientalists 1923, vol. I. pp 297-314.

and modified by Sanskritic traditions, and the Muhammadan culture based on Persian and Arabic literatures and partly expressed in the vernacular form in Urdu. The Muhammadans have not inherited any dramatic traditions from the classic languages of their culture for no drama exists in the otherwise admirable and highly developed Persian and Arabic literatures. In the Dravidian country in the South, what dramatic tradition existed was the tradition of the Sanskrit drama.

Thus we find that in the development of what dramatic literature exists in the modern vernaculars of India, the same process has repeated itself in each individual case. The course followed is simply this : acquaintance with Shakespeare leads to a revival of interest in the classical Sanskrit drama, the two models are then studied side by side, translations from and imitation of both next follow and a final choice of the type to be followed in original production in the vernacular is, last of all, made.

The above may be illustrated from the case of one of two languages where some scanty account exists with regard to the rise and growth of the modern dramatic literature. A full and reliable history of this has not yet been attempted in a single language and it may be said that in the majority of cases, not much materials as yet exist for a history, for the dramatic literature is very meagre. The history of the

Bengali drama begins in 1821 with the appearance of "Kali-rajaryatra"**. "Vidya Sundar" was dramatised and staged first in 1831 (c.f. Visvakosh, article headed Nataka, By Nagendra Nath Vasu, Part IX, 1st, 2nd and 3rd series : also the Bengali stage pp 2-3, by Dhananjaya Mukherji). Between this and 1849 there does not seem to have been any dramatic productions. From 1849 earnest efforts begin to take place. The following plays written after Sanskrit dramas appear in the given order. Mahanataka by Ramgati Kaviratna (1849), Ratnavali by Nilmani Pal (1849), Nal Damayanti and Kirtivilash by Jogendra Chandra Gupta (1852). In 1852 also appears Vadrarjuna Nataka by Tarachand Sikdar written in imitation of English drama. This is also the year when Hara Chandra Ghosh's adaptation of The Merchant of Venice - Bhanumatī - Chittavilash is written. In 1854 appears "Kulina Kula Sarvasva" by Ram Narayan Tarkaratna, sometimes mistaken as the first dramatic production in Bengali. In 1855 appears Sakuntala Nataka by Nanda Kumar Ray and in 1856 Venisamahara by Ram Narayana Tarkaratna, both translations

** After the above was written, investigations in the matter by other workers have revealed the very interesting fact that the Bengali drama was ushered into existence in 1795 by Kerasim Lebedeff, a Russian adventurer in India who came to Calcutta in 1787, learnt Sanskrit, Bengali and Hindustani and translated into Bengali in 1795 two English dramatic pieces named The Disguise and Love is the Best Doctor. He also built an Indian Theatre in the same year and one of the above plays was performed in November of that year. The history of the Bengali drama thus begins in 1795 and not in 1821. These translated plays, however, do not exist and there is no trace of any dramatic pieces written in the intervening years between 1795 and 1821. (C.F. The Calcutta Review, October 1923 and November 1923 - the two supplements by Sir George Grierson and Sallendra Nath Mitra to M.N. Mukhopadhyay's article on "The Early English Theatre and the Bengali Drama").

from Sanskrit. In 1857 appears *Vodenduvikasa* by Isvar Chandra Gupta, a drama in imitation of Sanskrit *Prabodhachandrodaya*. *Vikramorvasi* appears about this time in a translation by Kali-prasanna Singha. Michael Madhusudan Datta, the inventor of the Bengali blank verse, one of the immortals in Bengali literature, a deliberate imitator of English models, published his drama *Sarmistha* in 1857 and followed this with *Krishnakumari* and other plays. Dinabandhu Mitra, another name of undying fame in the annals of Bengal, brought out his famous play *Nil Darpana* in 1860 and followed with *Sadhavar Ekadasi*, *Lilabati* and other plays. Both Dinabandhu and Madhusudan follow the model of the English drama. In 1862 appear a translation of the Sanskrit drama *Mudraraksasa* by Hari Nath Nyaratna^{nya} and an adaptation of *Prabodhachandrodaya* called *Nanoyatra Nataka*.

We have only mentioned the important productions during the period between 1849 and 1862. There are other productions mostly of the farcical type and by less known writers. Bengal at the time was on the throes of great social and religious upheavals and these plays are mostly directed against the prevailing social abuses and the disintegrating forces introduced by English education. Though their dramatic worth is little, most of them are after the pattern of the English drama. The period embraced between 1849 and 1866, the year of Girish Chandra's appearance on the stage may be regarded as the formative period of the Bengali drama and this period is full of experimentation with regard to the shape which the future Bengali drama should take. From the above account we find that

translation of Sanskrit dramas and imitation of the English drama have gone on together and that the genius of Madhusudan and Dinabandhu approved of the English model and secured it permanency in Bengali literature. Ever since their footsteps have been followed by Girishchandra, Amritlal, Rajkrishna, Jyotindranath, Rabindranath, Kshirodprasad, Dwijendralal and a host of others and the Bengali drama has freed itself from all the artificial shackles of the Indian classic model and has established itself as a free type patterned after the English drama.

In "Marathi Rangabhumi", a history of the present Marathi stage by Appaji Vishnu Kulkarni (1903), the beginning of the present Marathi drama is placed in the fourth decade of the 19th century. The first attempts are very crude imitations of Sanskrit dramas called Pauranik Natakas. The characters are mainly Devas and Rakshasas i.e. gods and demons and the play begins with a benediction pronounced by the manager. The Vidusaka is there indulging in humorous conversations. Then come the praise in song of god Ganessa and a prayer to goddess Sarasvati. They appear on the stage and bless the performance after which the regular business of the play commences with the manager indicating what is going to be enacted. The next phase in the development of this drama has been the rise of prose plays in imitation of the models supplied both by the Sanskrit drama and by the English drama. Shakesperian plays such as Julius Caesar, The Merchant of Venice were performed by college students and in imitation such Sanskrit plays as Sakuntala, Veni-sambhara, Hrechakatika were next performed. This led to the

imitation of both kinds in original dramatic writings. Marathi translations of such Sanskrit dramas as *Mrochakatika*, of such Shakesperian plays as *Romeo and Juliet* (*Shasikala* and *Ratnapal*), *Cymbeline* (*Tara Bataka*), *The Comedy of Errors* (*Bhrantikrtacamatkara*), *Othello*, *King Lear*, *The Taming of the Shrew* (*Tratika*) were produced and staged. In this way original dramas have originated, which are now to be seen in the form of historical plays based on past incidents of Maratha history and social plays directed against English-educated Indians, also against such pernicious social customs as early marriage, wine-drinking, extortion of exorbitant marriage doweries. There is another class of Marathi dramas called *Sangit* dramas in which the musical element preponderates. These *Sangit* plays owe their birth directly to the inspiration of the Sanskrit drama and retain as much of the features of their original as they can. They contain prologues and epilogues in the manner of Sanskrit plays. Prose and verse are mixed, the latter predominating. *Slokas* (quatrains) couplets and other forms of musical speeches abound and songs lend a distinguishing feature. These plays seem to have quite a hold on Marathi literature and evidently they enjoy a great vogue. This is an interesting point for us to note and remember. In the case of the Bengali drama, we have seen that though it has developed through an interaction between the ancient Sanskrit model and the English model, it has long made its final choice of the freer type and has since been developing itself on that line. It is now beyond the reach of the cramping influence of the indigenous classical model. The struggle, so far as Marathi literature is concerned,

is not yet over. The existence and vogue of the Sangit plays bear witness to the fact that the conflict is still raging. In this matter the literary instinct of Bengal which is very sure may be fully trusted and it may be hoped that here, as elsewhere, her example will be followed not only in Marathi literature but also in other vernaculars as they come to develop their respective dramatic literatures.

In an article entitled "The drama in Southern India" in The Indian Stage (Feb. 1911, vol. I No. 2) a writer Mr. G.C.V. Srinivasacharya dates the modern drama in the Southern vernaculars (Tamil and Telegu) from 1881. He says that prior to that date there existed a kind of religious plays like the passion plays of the early English stage and also something of the nature of Bengali Yatras - both kinds not real dramas, operatic and melodramatic rather than dramas, full of lyrics, verses and dances. The real drama in the South began about 1881 and the first productions are mostly incorrect translations of Sanskrit or English plays. Writing about Telegu dramatic literature in the same monthly Mr. P. Srinivasacharya (March 1911, Vol. I No. 3) confirms the remarks of the former writer. He writes "Dramatic literature in Telegu is one of recent growth. Though the Telegu poets of old from Raja Narendra's time sought to develop the literature by strictly following the footsteps of their Sanskrit predecessors, it is curious to find that they left severely alone dramatic composition which in Sanskrit succeeded in calling forth high praise even from foreign critics. Our classic writers translated the epics, produced renowned Kavyams on bh

the Sanskrit models, compiled lexicographical works on the lines of the Sanskrit works of that class and wrote treatises on grammar, alankara and rhetoric similar to those in that language. It may be stated here that even while translating the ~~xxx~~ old Sanskrit works on prosody, poesy and diction, our old Telegu writers have as a body eschewed translating such portions of them as dealt with dramaturgy. Thus there is no denying that for some reason or other our old masters refrained from dramatic composition and did not care, it must be said to their discredit, to leave anything behind savouring of the drama". Then he goes on to say that the first appearance of Telegu drama took place in the early part of the reign of Queen Victoria and since that time it has gone through the following phases in its growth. The first phase has been translations of Sanskrit dramas. The second, the writing of original dramas on Pauranic i.e. legendary and historical (semi-historical) stories, more or less on the lines of the Sanskrit masterpieces : the third stage which is the present stage, is the composition of original dramas founded on stories taken from foreign masterpieces of literature and oriental anecdotes worked out on lines indicated in Western dramatic compositions. Next he remarks as follows on the present phase of Telegu drama." In these works the stringent canons of dramaturgy revelled in by the Sanskrit Lakshana writers are to a great extent not followed. Erudite scholars of the old School are not wanting who take objection to this deviation.... I, for one, would not mind this sort of deviation. For the full play of emotions and for the histrionic elements in a play these rigid rules bristling with

technicalities of a delicate nature impede at every step the free play of the genius of the dramatic artist ; he is made to walk as it were on stilts." He concludes by arguing that the tradition of the Sanskrit plays should not be followed by the infant Telugu drama and his reasons are given in this order :-

(1) English educated people are used to the freedom of the drama ; (2) illiterate people do not care for classical rules and purity ; (3) As old Telugu writers have left no dramas and rules of dramatic composition (not even translations from Sanskrit), the Telugu writers of the present day have the full option to make a choice between the Sanskrit model and the English model - and the English model is superior. In English dramas we meet men and women as they are, and in Sanskrit dramas, as they should be ; hence the latter are less entertaining. The Sanskrit drama/shows its limitation by obeying the rule against the writing of tragedies for life is full of both comedies and tragedies.

The above quotation makes it perfectly clear in what direction the infant drama in the Bravidian country is tending, and also what course it has so far followed in its evolution. It will appear that the course traced is nothing different from what has taken place in the case of Sanskritic languages such as Bengali and Marathi and that the ultimate shape which this drama will assume promises to be the same.

We can sum up the position as follows :- At the time when Indians came to think of founding a dramatic literature in their respective vernacular tongues, which none of them possessed from the past, two models presented themselves before their

eyes for imitation. One was the classical Sanskrit drama of their own country heavy with antiquity, a native of the soil, rich and varied within its limits, claiming reverence from traditions and appealing to the heart as their very own ; and the other, an exotic of greater beauty, greater freedom, perfect workmanship and almost as varied as life itself, yet filling the mind with doubts if it could grow and thrive on a foreign soil. This leads to a comparing of notes for a time and the final issue is, as it has been noticed in the case of the most advanced of Indian vernacular literatures viz: Bengali a surrender to the infinite variety and charms of the foreign model and a total supplanting of the classical drama of India.

It is this comparing of notes, or in other words, this conflict between the Shakesperian model and the classic model of India that we find exemplified in the adaptations and translations of Shakespeare and which is purported to be studied in this chapter. Let us again refer^x to the first Indian version of a Shakesperian play viz: Bhanumati-Chittavilasa, an adaptation of the "The Merchant of Venice" and quote the English preface which the author writes to his work. "In presenting this piece of dramatic composition to my indulgent readers, I would observe that^{at} the suggestion of a European friend of native education, I had originally undertaken the translation of Shakespear's "Merchant of Venice" ----- But the plan was abandoned before I had distanced the flight of Jessica, some of my learned friends having surmised that my performance was not likely to be popular unless the mode in which it was done was altered. I took their advice and undertook to write it in the

shape of a Bengali Natuck or Drama, taking only the plot and underplots of the "Merchant of Venice" with considerable additions and alterations to suit the native taste ; but at the same time losing no opportunity to convey to my countrymen, who have no means of getting themselves acquainted with Shakespeare save through the medium of their own language, the beauty of the author's sentiments as expressed in the best passages in the play in question. The sort of reception my Natuck is to meet with from the public, I can by no means divine or guess at, the work being of a novel character, professing as it does to be a Bengali Natuck, though written much after the manner of an English play -----". The conflict of which we have spoken, thus makes its appearance in the very first Indian version of Shakespeare. The author of this work, though conscious of the fact that there is nothing in the Shakesperian model that calls for modification or alteration from the point of view of the dramatic art, out of consideration for the popularity of his venture, starts by attempting to effect a compromise between the two contending models. It would be interesting to study this work in some detail in order to find out what concessions he makes to the Indian type and what modification he carries out in Shakespeare in obedience to the demands of the Indian model.

The work under notice begins in the orthodox classical fashion with a Mandi or opening prayer addressed to the goddess of learning. At the end of the prayer, as usual in the Sanskrit drama, the Manager appears on the stage, addresses the audience and calls his wife - an actress - who dutifully enters

the stage in obedience to the summons, and sings a song in the conventional manner about the spring season. This is followed by another song sung by the Manager himself about love. This opening prayer and a prologue in which the Manager and an actress appear preliminary to the business of the drama are essential features of the Indian classical drama from which they are imitated here and which are intended here to convert Shakespeare into the orthodox Indian classical form. In addition to these formal peculiarities, many new characters are added, very few of which are however, ^{demanded} by the strict requirements of the classical drama. There is the conventional character of the Court clown Sadananda. He is aided and supported in his foolery by a female counterpart - his wife - another comical character, but not a necessity according to classical demands. In Shakespeare the comic element is confined to Launcelot but such a mean buffoon would not suit the dignity of an imitation of the classical Indian play. This explains the introduction of Sadananda and this introduction of ^{^a} court-clown gives rise to the need for a court. Portia's parents who are kept alive from different considerations are thus made King and Queen in order to admit of the character of this orthodox buffoon.

The modifying influence of the Sanskrit drama is also discernible in the somewhat lavish use of puns and very hackneyed Sanskritic conceits. For example, take the 8th Anga or Scene in the third act. Both Bhanumati and Susila (Portia and Nerissa) are married and they present rings to their husbands. As soon as this is done, enters Vilasa the

wife of the Court-clown Sadananda ~~and~~ and witty repartees take place. The wit mainly turns on puns or similarity of words bearing different meanings, similarity of verbal sounds - a very common humorous device in these classical plays. In the very same scene, the following conceit is indulged in by Susila (Merissa). It is rendered in English :-

SUSILA --- "We shall humbly implore the Lord of the night (The Moon) "hearken, O Lord, to the prayer of your votaries and desist from setting for a while, for tomorrow night being an inauspicious night, we shall burn in the fire of separation (from our husband's' beds). If the Lord of the Water-Lily (The Moon), turns a deaf ear to us, then we will emulate those milkmaids suffering from the pangs of separation at the absence of their Lord Krishna at Mathura and will fling ourselves before the wheels of his car thinking that the fear of killing women might restrain him from setting for a while and thus impel him to assuage our love pains a little".

The second Indian adaptation of Shakespeare which is also from the pen of the same author is similarly modelled on the Sanskrit drama. This is an adaptation of Romeo and Juliet called "Charu-mukha-Chittahara" in which he turns the Shakespearian prologue into a dialogue between the Manager and an Actress and recounts the history of enmity between the two rival houses and of attachment between the two star-crossed lovers. After the prologue, two songs are sung, not about the spring season as usual in the Sanskrit drama, but about love, its deceptions and disappointments. It is noteworthy that in this work he does away with the opening prayer.

Instances of this attempt to cast Shakespeare in the mould of the classical Indian drama are to be met with in subsequent publications. In a Bengali adaptation of Cymbeline called *Suella-Virasimba*, an epilogue in the conventional manner of the Sanskrit drama is added and it is introduced in the shape of a song sung by Belarius (*Bharata*) invoking God's blessings on the King and the country. The song is in the orthodox vein and may be rendered as follows :-

May the King please his people,
 May the people be loyal to him
 May all unite in happiness.
 May the earth be productive.
 May the goddess of learning smile on all,
 And bestow on them gifts of good intentions.
 Let peace and happiness extend their dominion,
 Let malice and envy perish,
 Let all-embracing love unfold itself.

In an adaptation of the "Winter's Tale" called *Madan-Manjari* (i.e. *Perdita*) the influence of conventional sentiments, conventional symbolism, conventional situations in the direction of modifying Shakespeare is very noticeable. The play has the form of a Shakespearean play and as far as that goes, it has no relation to the classic model. *Perdita* after whom the play is named and who is, according to the adapter, the heroine of the play, is, as in Shakespeare, the adopted daughter of a shepherd grown suddenly rich nobody knows how. A female friend and confidante - a very conventional character

in the Sanskrit drama - is added to her so that she might talk about her love for Florizel (Malayaketu) in the conventional way. What is most glaring is that in imitation of the classical court dramas, this heroine of apparently humble birth is endowed with a music-room where she and her friend practise music and discourse love. The love-making between Madammanjari and Malayaketu is also carried on in the approved classical manner and in a glow of conventional sentiments. The play is full of love songs charged with hackneyed sentiments and well-worn imageries. The following for example is a love-song sung by Madammanjari :-

What a treasure is love, O my friend,
None but a lover~~d~~ can ever assess it~~y~~ dearest,
The true relisher ever keeps himself immersed in it,
Like as the bee sipping honey always,

Woman kaxx is a priceless treasure, the crown of
a lover's head,

Just like the bright stone glaring and gleaming
on the Serpent's hood.

When the Ocean of love is churned, purest nectar
it yields up.

And drink lovers of it, drowned in happiness.

Another song may be rendered as follows :-

When the beloved is absent from sight,

How pained in heart one feels, dear friend !

When the heart's idol is got, one swims in happiness,

Like as the Chatakini seeing her beloved - the new
cloud.

The following song is sung, without any relevancy to the situation at the time when Polixenes (Jimutaketu) is informed by Camillo (Satyaprakas) of the design on his life.

"The sun is now set at the close of day,

Cupid now aims his flowery shafts at the love-sick ;

In fear of impending parting, under a load of grief,

Chakravaka and his mate pine away in gloom.

Another song runs thus :-

What a priceless jewel is love !

None but a lover knows it;

Waiting for the Moon's appearance, the lily in the pond,

Trets out her heart all day, with closed eyes.

In an adaptation of Romeo and Juliet named Ajaya-Singha VilassVati, we meet with the Sanskritic prologue. In place of the Shakesperian prologue we have the traditional Sutradhara or Manager making his appearance on the stage and singing a song in which the story of ^{the} play is disclosed. The most curious thing about this production is that it contains six acts in place of Shakespeare's five acts and this addition can only be explained as an imitation of the Sanskrit drama in which more than five acts are allowed and the existing specimens of which generally contain more than five acts.

In a so-called translation of Othello by one Kali Prasanna Chattopadhyaya - a production which we shall have occasion to notice in some details later - a very conventional character from the classical drama is introduced. It is the character of a buffoon significantly named Hasyarnava (the ocean of laughter) to the king of Mandara (Roderigo). All

the orthodox features are retained - he is a Brahmin by caste expending his wit on the well-worn theme of hunger and its urgency as against the claims of love. The king also is as lovesick as any king in the classical drama and his love is expressed in the same conventional sentiments.

In an adaptation of "As you like it" called *Amangal-Hangini* (i.e. Orlando and Rosalind) the forest of Arden is converted into a traditional hermitage and Corin and Silvius are raised to the dignity of being sons to hermits and Phebe becomes the young daughter of a hermit.

An attempt is made to lessen the tragedy of the play in an adaptation of *Macbeth* called *Rudrapala Nataka*. The author departs from the original in respect of the fate of Macduff's (Hanavira) wife and son. They are allowed to escape being butchered by the murderers who are, as in the original, employed on the bloody business. Hanavira's son is a mere baby and its sweet innocent smile awakens the conscience of one of the murderers, whose inter-vention saves their lives. The play is made to end with the restoration of Hanavira's wife and child to him. An explanation for this departure is not far to seek. The idea of tragedy was new to the Hindu mind and the adapter naturally thought that the crowding of the stage with murders might prove distasteful to Indian taste. We ^{should} remember that this work is one of the early Shakesperian versions. We shall meet with very pronounced examples of this nature in Marathi versions of Shakespeare.

In Marathi literature, as has already been pointed out, the conflict between the two types is still raging and is very

keen. A distinct type of drama called Sangit drama has been developed in it and it is largely modelled on the Sanskrit type. All the outward forms of an opening prayer and a closing prayer are preserved in it and before the commencement of the business of the play the Manager and an actor or actress appear in a prologue. All the adaptations of Shakespeare in Marathi which are labelled Sangit are of this kind. The predominant element in these dramas is song or lyrical verses. In imitation of the classical drama, a few lines of prose dialogue are followed by lyrical outbursts in a few lines of verse of varying metres and these are mostly intended to be sung. Sometimes Shakespeare's thoughts and sentiments are rendered in these lyrical outpourings; more often the conventional sentiments and images of the classical drama are drawn upon and employed. Sangit Sam-saya Sambhrama (The Winter's Tale), Sangit Salini (Romeo and Juliet), Sangit Prema Makaranda (A Midsummer Night's Dream), Sangit Sita Kataka (A Midsummer Night's Dream), Sangit Tara-Vilasa (Romeo and Juliet), Sangit Prema Gunpha (As you like it), to name some from many, are of this class.

As an illustration, we may take the first play in the above list. The play begins like a Sanskrit play with a Nandi or prayer to God in which Shakespeare is referred to as Kavi-Siromani i.e. the greatest of poets and success in the venture of putting one of his plays on the stage is humbly begged for. In the prologue which is a dialogue between the Manager and an actor the Manager communicates the name of the play and of its author - Shakespeare + briefly relates the story of the drama.

and winds up with a request to the audience that if any defect be noticed in the performance, the blame is his due, and if there is any merit, the credit goes to the immortal bard. The play concludes with a prayer to God Vignu^{ah} addressed by the author, which is a substitute for the ordinary Bharata-Vakya in a Sanskrit drama. It may be noted in passing that these Sangit adaptations of Shakespeare are more or less independent productions based on themes borrowed from Shakespeare. As a rule very little of Shakespeare is retained except the story. Additions and alterations are freely made sometimes in imitation of the Sanskrit drama, sometimes according to what is conceived to be the requirements of Indian taste and Indian setting, and not unoften without sufficient rhyme or reason. In the second scene, Act I of this work, Sudakshina (Hermione) has various premonitions such as a foreboding dream etc., regarding her husband's anger and estrangement and these premonitions are imitated from Uttara-Rama-Charita where Sita, before her banishment which takes place quite unknown to her, is similarly filled with indefinable feelings of some untoward fate impending over her. It has already been pointed out how the Chorus in the beginning of Act IV has been turned into a Viskambhaka in imitation of the Sanskrit drama.

In the preface of this drama the author discusses the nature of these Sangit plays and declares that a play of this kind is a conscious imitation of the Sanskrit plays with the object of displaying the operation of the various Rasas.

Sangit Prema Makaranda similarly begins with a prayer to God Gajanan. It has, however, no prologue in the form of a

dialogue between the Manager and an actor. This truncated opening according to the Sanskrit tradition shows that the author is not well acquainted with the features of the classic play. In other respects, it conforms to the Sangit type.

Conversation is carried on in prose and at the end of every speech there is a lyrical snatch. Dadra, Saki, Dingdi, Dhunali and various other forms of metre are used throughout. Madana Sena (Thesius) in a short prose speech tries to persuade Madanika (Hermia) to fall in with the wishes of her father and then bursts out into a few lines of poetry.

Bottom and his company are excluded from this adaptation. In their place we have the traditional fool of the Indian stage Sthulodara (Mr. Pot-bellied) and his lady love Krsangi (Miss Pinch) and a humorous love episode is enacted between them. Sthulodara at the instigation of Krsangi goes to the forest dressed fearfully with horns sticking out of his head and Salini (the fairy queen) is made to fall in love with him. The play ends with two songs - one of benediction and prayer for the welfare and prosperity of the country in imitation of the orthodox Bharata-Vakya and another in praise of the God Vishnu.

Another version of the same play Sangit Sita Nataka is a better attempt to mould Shakespeare on the Indian type but like others, it is not Shakespeare. What of Shakespeare he keeps is the story of Hermia's love for Lysander, her father's opposition to it in favour of Demetrius and some of the contrivances by which the course of true love is freed from impediments. Sutradhara or the Manager appears in the beginning

with an actress and utters the praise of Gajapati and prays for his aid towards the success of the play. Then follows a dialogue between the two in which the name and scope of the play are disclosed and a few words are addressed to the assembly of spectators. Then, at the request of the Manager the actress sings in the traditional vein a song about the Spring season and then withdraws after indicating the dramatic personae who are expected next on the stage. The piece is made to end with the conventional Bharata-Vakya.

Sangit Tara-Vilasa Nataka, an adaptation of Romeo and Juliet is significant in more than one way. It has all the features of a Sangit drama i.e. an imitation of the classical Indian play and there is very little resemblance with the original. The very first scene introduces a new situation and shows that Tara (Juliet) is in love with Vilasa (Romeo) and that her heart is irrevocably given away. Tara is won by the heroism displayed by Vilasa in confronting and subduing a rogue elephant which has broken loose - a very traditional situation in the folk tales of India. Next she is depicted as very angry at the thought of a match arranged for her by her parents, of which information is ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ reached her through her friend and confidante, Kalati. But what is most significant about this production is that it is not a tragedy. The influence of Sanskrit dramatic traditions is sharply perceptible in this attempt to turn a tragedy into a play with a happy conclusion. Romeo (Vilasa) and Juliet (Tara) are not allowed to die. In fact, Romeo is not given the occasion to make an attempt on his own life. Juliet is permitted to take poison but she is brought back to life by

the wonderful power of a mendicant (Benvolio in disguise) who, before the miracle is performed, is careful enough to wring a promise from her father that on her being restored to life, he the mendicant, will have the control of a father over her. The promise is given and after her revival, she is married to the godson of the ascetic who, as can be easily imagined, turns out to be Romeo. Thus the lovers are united in the end, the differences of the two rival houses are composed and their friendship ratified in the union. All this is done out of deference to the dictum of the Indian critic that a play with a tragic ending should not be written and put on the stage.

This play is also noted for its liberal use of classical conceits, classical imageries. In the 2nd act of this work, Vilasa makes love to Tara from under her window and he describes her beauty in the following terms : She is as beautiful as the goddess of love, she is a delighter of the eyes like the heavenly nymphs - Rambha or Urvasi, she is the river of erotic sentiments, scatterer of charms, lotus-eyed, smiling with the beauty of moonshine and graceful in movement as the elephant. Such like sentiments and common-place Sanskrit tags as "Are Sarvanāśe Smrutpanne arddham tyajati panditah" or "Kā to kāntā kaste putrah Smāro ymatīva vicitrah" are put into the mouth of the Acharyya in the third act. There is an epilogue in the form of a song called a "Chorus song" in which Shakespeare is belauded.

The above is not an isolated instance in which such liberty as turning a tragedy into a play with a happy conclusion

has been taken with Shakespeare. Another work of this nature is an adaptation of King Lear called Atipida Raja. Cordelia who is Mrgankamala in this version is saved from being hanged. The last scene is a sort of a happy reunion of King Lear (Atipida Raja) Cordelia (Mrgankamala), her husband (Rajavahana Raja) and Kent (Kantivarma). This departure from the play as regards its conclusion is a step which the author takes deliberately for in the preface of his work he discusses it propriety and tries to defend himself.

Here also, as in the previous instance, the change is influenced by the Sanskrit tradition. Not only does the author betray his lack of sense of the tragic grandeur of the original play but he also exhibits a defective conception of the Indian critical injunction on the matter. He does not keep his play free from murder and bloodshed which strict obedience to the Indian canon requires of him. Both Regan (Chandranana) and Goneril (Sasikala) die violent deaths as in the original. Edmund (Marutsena) is mortally wounded by his brother in a duel and expires on the stage.

This attempt to transform Shakespeare's tragedies has met with very little encouragement. Indeed, some look upon such liberties with horror and regard them as nothing less than an outrage on Shakespeare. We should remember at this stage the vehement protest against this kind of levity which Mr. Belsare the author of Premacha Kalasa (a translation of Rome and Juliet), enters in the preface to his work and the very able defence of tragedies which he builds there on the authority of the Rasa theory. We quoted him in full on a previous occasion

and a repetition of the arguments is hardly necessary. As a rule, the writers of Indian versions of Shakespeare very seldom interfere with his tragic plays in this manner. The two examples given above are exceptions which go to prove the rule. Not only this. Shakespeare's practice in this respect is being followed in modern Indian dramatic literature in the creation of original tragic plays.

Even Mr. Belsare who champions the cause of tragedies and fights against the tradition of the Indian stage in this respect is not free from Sanskrit influence in his translations of Romeo and Juliet. The work is very industrious and conscientious production and is almost entirely in prose. He, however, introduces a novel feature into it which consists of profuse quotations from Sanskrit texts given in the shape of footnotes. These quotations are such as supply parallels in thought and sentiments to particular passages in Shakespeare's text. A few instances may be given below :-

Act II. Scene I.

Romeo. Can I go forward when my heart is here ?
Turn back, dull earth, and find thy centre out.

The above is translated and in the footnote we find
Kalidasa quoted from Sakuntala :-

Gacchatipurah Sarīram dhāvati pascadāsansthitam Cetah
Cīnāmsukamīva Ketch prati-vātanāniyamānasya.

Again,

Act III. Scene III, 11.33-41.

Romeo more validity,
More honourable state, more courtship lives
In carrion flies than Romeo : they may seize
On the white wonder of dear Juliet's hand,
And steal immortal blessings from her lips,
Who, even in pure and vestal modesty,
Still blush, as thinking their own kisses sin ;
Flies may do this, but I from this must fly :
They are free men, but I am banished.

Against the translation of that passage we find in the footnote the following parallel passage quoted from Sakuntala :-

Calāpāṅgām dr̥ṣṭīm spr̥śasi bahusō vepathumatīm
Rahasyākhyāyīva svaṇasi mṛdā karnāntikacarah
Karau vyādhunvatyāḥ pivasi ratisarvasvamadharam
Vayam tattvānveśānmadhukara hatāstvam khalu kṛtī.

These quotations with which he adorns the tale are not always very happy ; yet they prove one thing beyond all doubts viz: that the author tries to find out analogy of any shape that exists between Shakespeare and the Sanskrit dramas and he would base Shakesperian study and appreciation on the discovery of such relationship. He also gives way, though very rarely, to the practice of tacking on a few lines of verse at the end of a prose speech (it should be remembered that his work is a prose translation) after the manner of the Sanskrit dramas. An instance occurs at the end of Scene V, Act I. After the speech of Juliet "My only love sprung from my only hate &c." 11.142-145, which is rendered in prose, four lines of verse are introduced.

Thus Sanskritic influences are to be discovered even in productions which do not profess to be of the Sangit type. Mohanechi Angthi Kīmba Jashastase (the ring of Mohana or Tit for Tat), a free adaptation of the Merchant of Venice, is a work of this kind. It has not the traditional opening prayer and the prologue but there is an epilogue or the traditional Bharatavakya - a prayer addressed to Vishnu the slayer of Kamsa. It is mainly in prose but Sanskrit slokas and Marathi padas with conventional sentiments and symbolisms occur here and there. In Act III, Scene II, the song which is sung before Bassanio's choice of the caskets warning him is replaced by a Sanskrit sloka and a few lines of Marathi verse.

In the latter which are rendered in English below, a typical classical conceit will be found.

The wise are seldom taken by outward appearances,
They extract the good out of everything
As the duck extracteth milk out of milk-and-water.

In Jhunjara Rava Nataka (Othello), when the meeting between Pitaji (Cassio) and Champaji (Bianca) taken place at the end of the third act, two well-known doharas are put into the mouth of Champaji and are perhaps sung. The second of this which she utters when infuriated at the sight of Kamalaja's (Desdemona) handkerchief contains a very hackneyed conceit. The two lines of verse in English mean :-

"When the honey is drunk and finished, the lotus has no more use for the bee, the fickle and faithless being".

In Sangit Samsaya Sambhrama already noticed, in act III Scene I the seat of Apollo's oracle, and Delphus, is naturally replaced by the hermitage of an ascetic Paramahansa Swami and this is placed on the Himalayas. The occasion is taken to give a fine description of the mountains so often immortalised in classical Kavyas. The Swami, a venerable figure, appears to the King's messengers singing the praise of the Lord and the prayer which is quoted below is a beautiful piece of poetry of the classical model and may be taken as a specimen of all the opening and closing prayers to be found in these versions :-

Jaya Jaya Īśa Śrī Jagadīśa ॥ Girijāraṇaṇā ahiṇvarabhūṣaṇā ॥
Pinākapaṇi vyāghrāmbaṛadhara Tripurāntaka Hara agha^{naga}ṇāśā ॥
Suramuniṇvaranuta varaṇā śaraṇāṅgata bhaya haraṇā vicitra
Kailasācalavāsā Paśupati saṁhara saṁhara yā bhaya^{vesā}ṇāśā ॥

In Hindi and Gujrati versions which are very few in number ,

the influence of the Sanskrit drama is similarly discernible. The Hindi version of The Comedy of Errors (Bhramajala Nataka) has a very crude imitation of the Sanskrit prologue. There is no opening prayer and the conventional figure of the Manager does not appear at the beginning. Instead, two actors are introduced on the stage, who welcome the audience, thank them for their pains and narrate briefly the story of the play. In a Gujrati prose adaptation of The Merchant of Venice, Strinayakala or Benipurna Bepari, verses are inserted at rare intervals and Sanskrit metres like Sardula - vikridita are attempted. Sanskrit tags as "Ahimsaparamodharmaḥ," "Karmana gahana gatih" are often displayed and not very pure Sanskrit slokas as the following are tried. Of course they contain well-known Sanskritic sentiments. For instance,

Vidyānāma narasya rūpanadhikam pracchanna guptam dhanam
Vidyā bhogakarī yaśaḥ suhakarī vidyā gurūṇāṃ guruḥ
Vidyā bandhujano vidēśa gamane vidyā parā devatā
Vidyā rājasu pūjitā natu dhanam vidyāvihīnaḥ paśuḥ.

Or,

Vipattau kim viśādena sampattau harsenakim
Bhavitavyam bhavatyeva karmanāmīdrśigatih.

The modifying influence of the Indian classical drama is seen at work in some of the names which some of these adaptations and translations bear. It must have been noticed that the Shakesperian title of a play has not been retained in every case. For example, some adaptations of The Merchant of Venice bear the following names :- "Bhanumati-Chittavilasa" (i.e. Portio and Bassanio), "Suralata" (i.e. Portia), "Pancali-parinaya" (i.e. the marriage of Portia). The Winter's Tale is named Madanmanjari (i.e. Perdita) or Rani Tamalini (i.e. Queen Hermione). Cymbeline is named "Susila-Virasimha" (i.e. Imogen and Posthumus Leonatus), "Tara-Nataka"

(i.e. Imogen). A Midsummer Night's Dream is called "Premamakaranda" (i.e. the flower of love), "Sita Nataka" (i.e. Hermia), "Jahanara" (Hermia). The Tempest is given the names of "Nalini-Vasanta", "Ferdinand and Miranda", Malati-Vasantam (all meaning Ferdinand and Miranda). As You Like It is named Ananga-Rangini (i.e. Orlando and Rosalind), Premagumpha (i.e. the garland of love). It appears from the choice of these titles and the deliberate avoidance of Shakesperian names that some influence must have been operating towards such a result. The titles chosen show that in each case an emphasis has been laid on the erotic ~~in~~ element in the play. This emphasis becomes intelligible when we remember the importance attached to the erotic sentiment in the classical drama. The classical Sanskrit drama, as will perhaps be remembered, is divided into ten kinds of which Nataka forms the chief kind and is regarded as the ype of all. In a Nataka the principal rasa is erotic or heroic, the other sentiments being employed only in a subordinate capacity. In the existing specimens of the classical drama, invariably the predominating sentiment is a sentiment of love. Not only this. It has been seen that in course of time, of the nine sentiments which are recognised as the proper subject-matter of poetry and drama, love or Srngara has come to acquire great prominence so much so that separate and elaborate treatment has been accorded to it in later rhetorical treatises till it has come to form itself the chief absorbing interest of Sanskrit poetry and drama. This absorption of the Hindu mind with this particular sentiment, its recognition as the chief theme of drama, are all reflected in the choice of the above titles. Even when Shakespeare does not intend that the lovers should form the

xx centre of interest in his play e.g. in *The Merchant of Venice* and that they should appropriate to themselves the roles of the hero and the heroine, Indian adapters depart from his intentions and try to fasten on the love element and focus all interest on it by naming the play after them.

It seems to us that even in the choice of the plays for treatment in Indian languages, Indian authors have been to some extent influenced by this obsession of the *Srngara rasa* or erotic sentiment from which they suffer. Lamb's part in this matter has already been pointed out and ^{it} has also been stated that of the twenty plays included in his *Tales*, only *Timon of Athens* has been so far ignored by Indian writers. There will be nothing surprising in it if the unpopularity of the play is partly due to the absence of all love-interest from it. *King Lear* is such another play ; but it is not neglected. How are we to explain its inclusion in the Indian versions ? The story of filial love such as Cordelia's has a peculiar fascination for the Indian mind and its tremendous grip on Indian imagination will be understood when it is remembered that ~~the~~ the great Indian epic *Ramayana* exalts such love over everything and that it owes not a little of its measureless attraction to Rama's exemplary love for and devotion to his father King Dasaratha. With the exception of the two historical plays *King Henry VIII* and *Richard III*, all the plays so far ~~xx~~ rendered in India have more or less a love interest in them. The avoidance of the English historical plays might also be partially explained in this way.

It is believed that the interaction which has gone on and is still going on between the Shakesperian type of drama and the ancient Indian type has been sufficiently demonstrated above. It is in the natural order of things that such an interaction should

occur when two differing models are thus confronted and present themselves for imitation. But the conflict which has been thus occasioned is of a very mild nature. We have already seen that inspite of its many artificial features which easily distinguish it from the Romantic Drama of England, the classical Indian drama in the fundamentals of its construction and structure is not far removed from the Romantic English drama. The limitations which are imposed on it by the elaborate and minute canons of its grammarians no doubt, interfere with its variety with regard to choice of subject matter, *dramatis personae* and even situations but such laws as the laws of the unities which restrict the freedom of the dramatic art and affect its very being by limiting its movement are equally absent from the Indian drama as from the English drama. Thus as far as the essentials of dramatic composition go, the two types are not opposed ; on the contrary, they present such astonishing resemblance as is not to be found even between the English drama and the classical European drama - the parent from whose loins the former is undoubtedly sprung.

The outcome of this conflict of models, as far as the most advanced Indian vernacular literature is concerned, is now beyond the pale of any uncertainties. Bengal has chosen the Shakesperian model, after some experimentations in both kinds and even some modest efforts to recast Shakespeare in the classic mould, with its greater freedom and variety. As in so many other things Bengal sets the example for the whole of India, it is not unreasonable to think that in this respect also her example will be followed all over India as the Vernacular tongues are sufficiently developed for the purpose of adding a permanent and independent dramatic

literatures. So far the literary judgment of Bengal has proved eminently sure and her literary activities have gained some measure of recognition from the world. In the circumstances, it is impossible to think that her example in the founding of her dramatic literature can be ignored by the rest of India. Marathi literature which perhaps in point of development occupies the next place to Bengali literature, is, as has been seen, still tenacious of the old classic form but its resistance is sure to be worn down. The admission of tragic plays into Marathi literature is a sign of the weakening hold of the ancient classic traditions. The retention of the two artificial appendages as the classical prologue and epilogue in the Sangit form of drama is now the only demonstration of its loyalty to the ancient tradition. Denuded of these two unnecessary accretions the Sangit plays can hardly be distinguished from English plays.

This triumph of Shakespeare over the classical Indian drama, which is already an established fact in the modern dramatic literature of some of the developed Indian languages and which can be easily predicted in respect of the other Indian vernaculars which are yet to grow, is the most significant feature of Shakespeare's vogue in India. The importance of this fact is increased a hundredfold when we remember that this classical drama is an independent creation of olden times and is in no way related to the classical drama of Europe which has been similarly overthrown by him. As far as we know, the only two well-known types of ancient drama now both lie as broken idols before the supreme dramatic genius of Shakespeare - an unequivocal testimony to the fact that as a dramatist he has no rival and that he is to be marked as the first among his fellow craftsmen.

But as far as the overthrow of the classical Indian drama is concerned, it should be remembered that Shakespeare's triumph means not the triumph of an essentially different type of drama but the victory of the freer of the two of almost the same type. Thus, while it adds a ~~fresh~~ fresh tribute to Shakespeare's unrivalled dramatic power, it reflects not much discredit on India's heritage. The old tradition in its purity is no doubt broken but divested of its artificial features by contact with Shakespeare, it yet lives and will always live glorified and reinforced in the new drama of India which is the product of these two contending yet mostly assimilable patterns.

We have seen how the history of the growth and development of India's modern dramatic literature is inextricably bound up with the name of Shakespeare. It is Shakesperian studies that revive interest in the ancient Sanskrit drama and through the translation or adaptation of these two kinds of dramas, a desire manifests itself for the production of original dramas in the different vernaculars. The modern Indian stage which is, like the modern Indian drama, somewhat developed in one or two provinces but is, as far as the whole of India is concerned, in its infancy, owes an equal debt to Shakespeare.

Materials for the history of the modern stage in India are very meagre and hard to get. In fact, no record for the whole of India exists and perhaps the time for such a record has not yet arrived. Still, from what records exist about the Bengali and Marathi stages it is seen that the modern Indian stage is a child of the English type and it owes its birth to enthusiasm for Shakespeare. The professional or amateur theatres that are to be found at the present day in Bengal and elsewhere are all on the

lines of the modern picture theatres of the West.

The rise of this Indian stage is like the rise of the modern Indian drama. The introduction of English education and consequent knowledge of Shakespeare led to the staging of Shakespeare's plays in schools and colleges. This, in its turn, with the revived interest in Sanskrit plays led to the simultaneous performance of Sanskrit dramas by the young enthusiasts of educational institutions. Next followed the formation of amateur companies and establishment of amateur theatres outside the precincts of educational institutions, mainly devoted to the staging of English and Sanskrit plays. These amateur companies also tried their hands at the production and staging of original plays in the vernaculars. As these original productions increased in numbers, the professional theatres came into being but their number is still negligibly small considering the population and the vastness of the country.

From a very small history of the professional Bengali stage (called Bangiya-natya-sala or the Bengali stage) which is perhaps the only book of its kind in existence it appears that its history dates from 1873, the year

of the foundation of the National Theatre (see p.p.2 - 3).** Before this, as we have seen the earliest play Kali-rajar-yatra was, according to the editor of the Visva Kosa, produced and performed in 1821 and the performance was no doubt given by an amateur company. According to the same authority, the next play to be performed on the private stage of Nabin Chandra Vasu of Bagbazar in Calcutta, was a dramatised version of Bharat Chandra's Vidyasundara and it took place in 1831. According to an article on the same subject in the monthly magazin Anusilan (Nos.1,2,3,4 and 5 for the months of Asvin, Kartik, Agrahayan, Paush and Magh, Bengali year, 1301), this date is 1833. The following quotation from the October number (1835) of the "Hindu Pioneer" - an English Monthly - is made in that article as an account of the "Native Theatre" at the time. "This private theatre got up about two years ago is still supported by Babu Nabin Chandra Bose. It is situated in the residence of the proprietor at Sham Bazar (in Calcutta) where four or five plays were acted during the year. These are native performances by people entirely Hindus, after the English fashion in the vernacular language of their country". The article does not mention any plays produced and performed between 1836 and 1853. 1853 is next given as the year when an English translation of Uttara-rama-carita by H.H. Wilson was staged under the patronage of Babu Prasanna Kumar Tagore. It is also staged that in the same year

**According to a recent discovery noted on page 187, the history of the first foundation of an Indian Theatre goes back to 1795 and the credit for it goes to a Russian, Herasim Lebedeff. This Indian Theatre of 1795, however, seems to have been born out of due time and thus it leads to no indigenous efforts nor to a continuity. It remained for the 19th century to give rise to such efforts, the 2nd or third decade of which marks the beginning of them and 1873 appears to be the year in which such efforts culminate in the founding of the first professional Theatre under Indian management. Henceforward it follows a continuous and uninterrupted course.

Shakespeare's Julius Caesar was staged at a school in Battala (In Calcutta) under the direction of Guruchand Dutt of the well-known Dutt family. In the house of another well-known man Peary Mohan Bose, it is stated, the following Shakesperian performances were given between 1853 and 1855. Othello 1853, three nights ; The Merchant of Venice 1854, two nights ; Henry IV 1855, two nights. Between 1853 and 1854 came to be established the Oriental Theatre (an amateur institution) as an adjunct of the Oriental Seminary - an education^{al} institution of the day - under the patronage of Gour Mohan Addy. The following extract from a letter written by Gourdas Basak and quoted in the life of Michael Madhusudan Datta is given in this article. "Next in 1853/4 some of the ex-students of the Oriental Seminary formed a dramatic corps under the drilling of Messrs Clinger and Roberts who belonged to the old Sans-Souci Theatre and opened a stage called the "Oriental Theatre" in the premises of the Seminary, where they acted the plays of Othello and The Merchant of Venice. It was Babu (since Maharaja Sir) Jatindra Mohan Tagore who, first of all, suggested to them that they should introduce native dramatic representations and organise a native orchestra on the basis of our native instruments. Acting upon this hint they produced the sensational play of "Kulin-Kula-Sarvasva" (1854) and then the theatre abruptly became defunct in 1856." The next record is regarding the staging of Hamlet in 1857 by the famous religious and social reformer Keshab Chandra Sen in his native village. The following quotation is made from the life and teachings of Keshab Chandra Sen by Pratap Chandra Majumdar about this performance :- "But Keshab was content not only to read, but wanted to act, a desire in which we all warmly seconded him. We were

also supported by our elder relatives. So a stage was improvised, cast-away European clothes were speedily procured from the Bazaar and we painted our faces and got up our parts as best as we could. Keshab played Hamlet most successfully - he had the constitution of the Danish prince by nature. The present writer (he is also a great Bengali of the 19th century) took the part of Laertes, while Narendranath Sen (a great Bengali journalist of the last century) who had a thin girlish voice at the time played Ophelia very feelingly. Considering our age and training, the performance was successful. We kept up the play from time to time until Keshab's theatrical propensities developed into the Bidhaba Bibaha Nataka a little while afterwards".

The year 1857, the year of the Mutiny and also memorable as the year when Universities were first founded in India, seems to be also a remarkable year in the annals of the Bengali stage. "Kulin Kula Sarvasva" - a play already noticed as having been staged for the first time between 1854 and 1856 - was twice reproduced on the amateur stage during this year. In the same year Captain Palmer Professor Richardson of Hindu College, Rasiklal Sarkar formed an amateur company for the systematic production of Shakesperian plays. Such well-known men as Raja Pratap Chandra, Isvar Chandra, Jatindra Kali Prasanna Sinha, Jatindra Mohan Tagore felt attracted by these performances and their fascination gradually spread to the English educated middle class residents of Calcutta. A wave of dramatic performance passed over Calcutta and the infection was caught outside in distant villages. Sakuntala, Kadamvari, Veni-Sambara, Vikramorvasi from Sanskrit were translated into Bengali to replenish the Bengali repertoire which could hardly keep pace with its

Shakesperian rival. Such distinguished men as Kaliprasanna Singha, the renowned barrister, Umesh Chandra Banerji, Beharilal Chatterji appeared on the stage as actors. The next year 1858 sees a little more advance in the development of the Bengali stage. It is noted for the performance of a Bengali version of Ratnavali by Pandit Ramnarayan Tarkaratna under the auspices of Rajas Pratapchandra and Isvarchandra of the well-known Paikpara Raj family. The play was staged in the private "Belgachia Theatre" founded by these distinguished scions of the noble family and the then Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, Sir Frederick Halliday, was present at the performance. The event was hailed with great enthusiasm and it was felt that the future of the Bengali stage was assured and that it had come to stay.

The article which we have utilised in compiling the above account carries us down to 1859, the year of the performance of "Vidhava-Vivaha" - propaganda play in favour of the movement of the remarriage of widows in the staging of which the great social reformer Keshab Chandra took the leading part and in which one of the greatest sons of Bengal Pandit Isvar Chandra Vidyasagar, the initiator of the above movement, took a keen interest.

From 1859 onwards it seems that English plays which still held the day gradually came to be replaced in the amateur theatres by vernacular productions the number of which began to increase. 1860 is the year of the publication of one of the greatest Bengali plays "Nila Darpana" by Dinabandhu Mitra, which created a great sensation by exposing the cruelty and rapacity of the Indigo-planters of Bengal. It was not, however, until 1872 that this play was

first produced on the stage by an amateur company named the National Theatre in the private residence of Babu Madhusudan Sanyal at Jorasanko (C.F. a short sketch of Girish Chandra Ghosh's life in Abhinetr Kahini by Anarandranath Datta). No account is available of the doings of the Bengali stage between 1859 and 1866 but it would not be far wrong to guess that the private theatres, were, during this period, engaged in the occasional staging of such vernacular plays as already existed. The ^{year} 1866 is a memorable year in the history of the Bengali stage for it marks the foundation of an amateur dramatic company by the greatest of Bengali actor-dramatists Girish Chandra Ghosh, and his first entrance into the field. Girish Chandra afterwards became a professional and was the dominating figure in the varied capacities of manager, actor, dramatist in the world of Bengali drama throughout the rest of the 19th century and in the first decade of the twentieth. He is one of the creators of the professional stage in Bengal and his amateur company started in 1866 assumed in 1873 the shape of the first professional company in Bengal under the designation of the National Theatre.

We need not pursue the history of the Bengali stage beyond this emergence of the professional theatre for its fortunes henceforth are little connected with the Shakesperian plays or English plays. In fact, from Girish Chandra's advent in 1866, the stage seems to be wholly absorbed in the production of original vernacular plays which were being written at the time ~~of~~ by two great sons of Bengal, Michael Madhusudan Datta and Dinabandhu Mitra. Girish starts his stage career by producing Madhusudan's "Sarmistha" and follows this with Dinabandhu's "Sadhaavar Ekadasi", Lilavati, Jamai Barik, Nabin Tapasvini, Nila-Darpana and

and Madhusudan's Krishna-Kumari till on the foundation of the professional stage, he himself launches into original productions. Ever since the stage has been held by his plays and the plays of many eminent followers in his footsteps.

The above account will make it plain how the most advanced stage in India owes its birth directly to the inspiration of Shakespeare. The same story reveals itself in the account of the Marathi stage which has been written by Mr. Kulkarni and it is not unreasonable to conclude from the sameness of the process followed in the evolution of the different dramatic literatures of the present day in India that the same course will be repeated in the growth of the professional stage in the different parts of India.

As far as Bengal is concerned, Shakesperian translations and adaptations have very rarely been put on the stage. It seems that they are more intended for the study and less for representation on the stage. It is more or less true of all the versions in the different Indian tongues for the stage is yet undeveloped. Girish Chandra's admirable translation of "Macbeth" is the first to be put on the public stage in Bengal (1900). It was first acted in Minerva Theatre and then in the Classic Theatre but it failed to take on. The following notice about the performance (quoted in Abhinetr-Kahini by Amarendra Nath Datta) appeared in the Englishman, an Anglo-Indian Daily : "A Bengali Thane of Cawdor is a lively suggestion of incongruity, but the reality is an admirable reproduction of all the conventions of our English stage". About the merits of the translation such competent authorities as Justices Chandra Madhav Ghosh, Gurudas Banerji, Mr. (Now Sir) K.C. Gupta, made the following pronouncement :- "To translate the inimitable

language of Shakespeare was a task of no ordinary difficulty, but Babu Girish Chandra Ghosh has performed that task very creditably and his translation is in many places quite worthy of the original. The part of Macbeth was taken by Girish himself and Lady Macbeth was very competently rendered by Miss Tincowri, a renowned actress of the day. But as has been already remarked, inspite of the beauty of the translation and money and histrionic talents lavished on the production, the ordinary playgoers were not attracted by a foreign play. Girish Chandra was very much pained at the cold reception of his production and very reluctantly gave up the idea of translating all the plays of Shakespeare and putting them on the boards. It was a sad decision ^{for} of Bengal's dramatic literature for from his competent pen we might have expected very faithful and very beautiful translations of all Shakespeare's plays which are still a desideratum.

A translation of King Lear by Jatindra Mohan Ghosh (1902) is the next Shakesperian version to be staged by an amateur Company in Bengal. In the title page of the work it appears that the translation was expressly made for being staged by the members of the Chorebagan Union Library and Leisure Hour Club.

Two Shakesperian adaptations to be put on the public stage in Bengal are Jahanara (A Midsummer Night's Dream, 1904) and Seodagar (The Merchant of Venice, 1915). The first was acted in the Unique Theatre and the cast which is given in the book of words contains such well-known names in the Bengali stage as Ranu Babu, Tarak Palit and Miss Tara Sundari. It is evident the play met with success but it is not Shakespeare. It is in prose and full of songs and dances and is very appropriately called a musical comedy. The story of the original is kept in the main ~~is~~

situations but otherwise it is a new and inferior production based on the Shakesperian theme. The second play was staged in the Star Theatre and is of the type of the first. Here also the cast is given and a very distinguished Bengali actor and dramatist of the day Amarendra Nath Datta took the part of Kuliraka (Shylock). The other well-known actors and actresses who appeared in it are Nripendra Chandra Basu, Kasinath Chattopadhyaya, Kunjalal Chakravarty, Mammatha Nath Pal, Miss Kusum Kumari, Miss Hemanta Kumari, Miss Archaryya Mayee, Miss Narayani. It seems that this play also went with a measure of success but again like its predecessor it is not Shakespeare.

In Mr. Kulkarni's account of the Marathi stage we find that many Shakesperian versions such as Tara, Bhuranti Kirta Camatkara, Sasi Kala and Ratna Pal, versions of Othello, King Lear were were produced with some measure of success on the Marathi stage. This is confirmed by ^{an} ~~my~~ prose version of Othello named Jhunjara Rava Nataka which is distinctly labelled as a stage version. Inside, it abounds with stage directions for the guidance of the actors in their stage deportment and the speeches are in most cases cut short or otherwise abbreviated to suit the needs of the stage or to bring it within manageable limits for a few hours' representation on the stage.

It is a well-known fact that the Urdu versions of Shakespeare are very popular on the stage in Northern India and they very often figure rather prominently in the bills of some of the few touring companies that we have at the present time, especially those which go by the name of Parsee Theatrical Companies.

Before we leave this subject of Shakespeare's influence on the growth of both the modern Indian drama and modern Indian stage, it seems necessary that we should make a passing reference to a kind of popular dramatic entertainment which exists even to-day in almost all the provinces and which dates from ages before the advent of the English, though it is not yet exactly ascertained when. These are the Yatras of Bengal, Tāmāsha, Lalita and their later development -Pauranic plays- of Maharastra, Bhāgavatam, Yakshāganamas, Prahlāda and Mārkaṇḍeya natakas and Yātārās of Southern India. These are mainly operatic or melodramatic (In the older sense) performances containing little dialogue, mostly songs originally connected with religious festivals, now also independently produced. The vogue of these popular entertainments was revived just at the time when the modern drama was coming into existence i.e. towards the middle of the 19th century and ever since they have been running a course alongside of the regular drama. Sometimes claims are advanced in their name in respect of their supposed share in the building up of the modern Indian drama.

Thus, for an example, early in the 19th century there was a great revival of Yatra plays in Bengal, their subject-matter being mainly the love of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. These were known as Kṛṣṇa Yatras. There were other kinds also such as Vidyāsundara Yatras, Manasar Bhasan Yatras, Rāma Yatras. These entertainments, according to Rai Bahadur Dinesh Chandra Sen - perhaps the greatest authority on the subject, come down from the days of Chaitanya (c.f. his Bengali Language and Literature Ch. VI. Sec. IV. The Yatras or popular theatres). With this revival is associated the name of a famous Bengali Krishna Kamal Goswami (1810-1888) whose

best works were written by 1850. The enthusiasm which was created for his plays throughout Bengal, especially in the eastern portion of it, will ever remain one of the wonders of Bengal's literary history. These popular plays still hold their own and outside Calcutta they are the only kind of theatrical entertainment available except amateur performances of the regular drama, which are few and far between.

These plays, as has been remarked, are in the nature of operas. There is very little action and even dialogues are mainly conducted in songs. The performances are generally open air performances without any scenic aid, stage or stage properties. Nowadays some attention is paid to make-up and costumes but they are of the most elementary type. The various incongruities which disfigure these representations are enough to drive the mildest dramatic critic raving mad. But they have a redeeming feature about them and it is the richness of poetry and thought which most of these compositions display. They depend for their success on this single element alone.

The claims of these plays to a share in the growth of the modern drama proper or the modern stage seem to be extravagant. As far as the stage is concerned, their claims are wholly untenable. On the contrary, as far as costumes and make-up go, these performances are borrowing a good deal from the regular stage in order to suit themselves to the educated taste. It seems to us that the drama in one respect has been slightly influenced by them. It is a noted feature of the present day Indian dramas that they must have a strong element of songs and dances in them. Some of the Shakesperian adaptations are of this operatic nature. Without

a liberal infusion of songs in it, a play is little likely to succeed on the stage. In his otherwise admirable translation of Macbeth, Girish Chandra introduces a few songs not to be found in the original for as a manager and producer of practical experience, he knew very well the taste of the groundlings. This song element, it appears to us, is a contribution of the popular Yatras to the regular drama. In other respects it owes very little to these plays and it is, as we maintain, a direct child of the inspiration received from English education, modified or reinforced as the case may be by a revival of interest in the ancient Sanskrit drama.

Chapter III.

Shakespeare in Bengali Literature.

Bengali literature easily ranks first among the present day vernacular literatures of India. In more copiousness, in solid achievements, in versatility and especially in really gifted practitioners of it, it is hard to beat in India. The recognition which has been extended to it by the world in the bestowal of the Nobel prize on one of its brightest luminaries Sir Rabindra Nath Tagore is a sufficient testimony to its high quality. It is a child of Sanskrit but its foster-mother is English. In a framework of language supplied by that ancient tongue of immortal power and beauty, the English models have raised such a novel creation as will perpetuate their joint glory for all time to come. This premier position of the Bengali tongue and literature is perhaps due to the fact that Bengal was the first to come under English influence. English education first struck root on Indian soil in Bengal and the power of the people to respond to its good influences, which almost amounts to genius, led to the founding of a literature which has since then been progressing with rapid strides towards a goal which promises to be nothing short of glorious. By a stroke of peculiar good fortune, the makers of the modern Bengali literature from Raja Rammohan Ray downwards have all been ripe English scholars, some of them as Michael Madhusudan Datta being considerable linguists in the ancient and modern European languages, with a deep foundation of sanskritic erudition. The result has been

an endeavour to incorporate in the new literature all that is best in the East and the West.

It is therefore natural to expect that Shakesperian versions in this most progressive language in India must have been carried out more successfully than elsewhere and it may be stated without any fear of contradiction that the expectation is more than fulfilled in respect of those adaptations and translations in Bengali which are commonly considered as successful efforts. All the resources of this powerful tongue have been employed by highly gifted writers in rendering some of Shakespeare's works and the result achieved is in such cases quite worthy of the man to whose memory they are a tribute. Indeed, the number of such versions is disappointingly small, but that does not detract from their intrinsic merit. Many factors have gone towards this limitation of number, the most potent of them being, as has been already pointed out, the rapid spread of English education and the gradually widening firsthand knowledge of Shakespeare that obtains in Bengal and elsewhere in India. After all, translations are translations and they can not take the place of the originals and the hope is always there in India that as education will spread more and more and become more and more universal, Shakespeare will be read and enjoyed in the original by an ever-increasing number of Bengalees and others. The activities of modern Bengali literature are not more than a hundred years old and it seems to us that its practitioners up to date have shown admirable good sense in refraining as much as possible from mere works of translation and in devoting

their best energies to original creations inspired no doubt by English models. Now that the tongue has been fully moulded for any purpose, the claims of the literature to world-recognition have been satisfied and the dream of universal English education yet seems very remote from realisation, it may be hoped that at no distant date all the immortal works of Shakespeare will be translated for the benefit of those whose access to them will never lie except through their own tongue. An educated Indian or a Bengali like an educated Welshman, Scotchman or Irishman is, though to a much less extent, bilingual and for him translated Shakespeare is as useless as a Welsh, Scotch or Irish translation is for them. But such Indians will always remain in a minority and the treasures of the greatest dramatist of the world must be unlocked with a vernacular key if the majority are not to be deprived of their legitimate share in the richest literary heritage left to mankind by one who laboured not for this or that particular clime or for this or that particular people, but for all humanity. It is Kanchandra, the great Bengali poet who, to one of his Shakesperian adaptations, inscribes his own pithy saying about Kalidasa - "Bhāratara Kālidāsa, jagatera tumi" (India's Kalidasa, of the world thou art !) and intends it to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to Shakespeare - Britain's Shakespeare, the world claims thee !

In this chapter we propose to trace the history of the Bengali versions of Shakespeare, to indicate the manner in which the work has been begun and so far carried on, and to study in some details the successful renderings with an exposition of the secrets of their success and with quotations of

illustrative passages from these works such as will establish their title to being regarded as successful productions. Some of the features of these adaptations and translations have already been discussed and we shall try to avoid all repetitions.

Below is given a bibliography of Bengali translations and adaptations in their chronological order. It may be pointed out that in this list are included translations of Lamb's Tales and narrative prose versions of the stories of Shakespeare's dramas.

ADAPTATIONS.

1848. Romeo-o-Julietar Manohara Upakhyana (prose story).
1852. Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare by Muktaran Vidyavagish and friends.
1853. Bhanumati-Chittavilasa by Harachandra Ghosh (The Merchant of Venice).
1864. Charunukha chittahara by Harachandra Ghosh (Romeo and Juliet).
1868. Sushila-Virasinha. Anonymous. (Cymbeline).
Bhrentivilasa by Pandit Isvarchandra Vidyasagar (prose story - The Comedy of Errors).
1872. Sushila-Chandraketu by Kantichandra Vidyaratna (prose story - The Twelfth Night).
1873. Bhramajala Nataka by Venimadhava Ghosh (The Comedy of Errors).
1874. Amarsinha by Prematha Natha Vasu (Hamlet).
Rudra-pala Nataka by Haralal Ray (Macbeth).

1875. Bhimasinha by Tarinicharan Pal (Othello).
1876. Madanmanjari. Anonymous. (The Winter's Tale).
1876. Brutus-o-Antonir Vaktrta (a poem).
1877. Buralata Nataka by Pyarilal Mukhopadhyaya (The Merchant of Venice).
1878. Ajaya sinha - Vilasavati by Yogendra Narayan Das Ghosha (Romeo and Juliet).
1894. Chandranath by Siddhesvara Gupta (Hamlet).
Othello by Kali Prasanna Chattopadhyaya.
1895. Romeo-Juliet by Hemchandra Bandopadhyaya.
- 1896-1900. The plays of Shakespeare by Haranachandra Raksita
(prose stories).
1897. Ananga-Rangini by Annada Prasad Vasu (As You Like It).
1900. Nalini-Vasanta by Hemchandra Bandopadhyaya (The Tempest).
1904. Jahanara by Satishchandra Chattopadhyaya (A Midsummer Night's Dream).
1905. Rudrasena by Hanilal Bandopadhyaya (Othello).
1909. Vinimaya by Birendra Nath Ray (Measure for Measure).
1914. Tamalini by Dhanadacharan Mitra (The Winter's Tale).
1915. Saodagar by Bhupendra Nath Bandopadhyaya (The Merchant of Venice).

TRANSLATIONS.

1875. Macbeth by Taraknath Mukhopadhyay.
1894. Hamlet by Chandi Prasad Ghosh.
1900. Macbeth by Girish Chandra Ghosh.
1902. King Lear by Yatindra Mohan Ghosh.
1907. Julius Caesar by Jyotindra Nath Thakura.

1913. Jhanjha (The Tempest) by Nagendra Prasad Sarbadhikary.
 1922. The Merchant of Venice by Mon Mohan Ray.
 Hamlet by Monmohan Ray.

It will appear from the above list that 1848 is the year in which Shakespeare makes his first appearance in Bengal and it may be repeated that this is his first appearance in an Indian language. A prose story of Romeo and Juliet forms his first introduction and in all likelihood, the story is inspired by Lamb's Tales. It has already been remarked that this first Shakesperian venture is launched under the blessings of a Sanskrit Pandit who shows himself highly interested in the spread of the knowledge of Shakespeare among his countrymen. The second venture which is a translation of Lamb's Tales and is published in 1852 is also the second attempt of the kind in the whole of India and is again the work of an orthodox classical scholar in collaboration with his friends. The great part played by Lamb's Tales in sponsoring Shakespeare in India is also apparent from the above list.

The first real attempt to adapt a Shakesperian play is, however, made in 1853. The preface which the author writes to his work bears the date 1852, but the book is published in 1853. Chronologically this forms the third Shakesperian venture in Bengal, though as regards real adaptations it should be regarded as the first of its kind not only in Bengal but in the whole of India. Some of its characteristics have already been noticed. It will be remembered that the author says in the preface that he has attempted in this work to write a Bengali Nataka on the Shakesperian theme retaining

as much as he could the beauty of the original author's sentiments in the best passages. We have also seen what the author means by a Bengali Nataka as far as that involves copying the model of the ancient Sanskrit drama.

This work "Bhanumati-Chittavilasa" is mainly in verse with a sprinkling of prose dialogue here and there. It should be noted here how at the very beginning poetical adaptations of Shakespeare are attempted in Bengal. But the poetical medium used here is not very suitable for the purpose. Blank verse which has been subsequently employed in the successful Bengali adaptations had not yet come into being. The verses used here are the rhymed verses of the Payār, Bhāṅga-payār, Dvipadī, Tripadī, Dīrghatripadī, Laghutripadī, Chatuṣhpadī, Dīrghachatuṣhpadī, Chāmar, Antahjanak, Māljhāp type in vogue at the time and made popular by the school of poetry associated with the name of Bharatchandra. The influence of Bharatchandra's Vidyasundara is discernible in many respects in this work and when we remember the author's statement that he was writing his play in the manner of a Bengali nataka, it seems to us that he meant by this an imitation of Vidyasundara as well. We know how at this time there was a vogue of the popular Yatra which was revived some years ago and there was a particular kind of Yatras called Vidyasundara Yatras i.e. dramatic versions of Bharat Chandra's popular work. Somewhere between 1831 and 1833, Vidyasundara was also acted on the private stage of Naba Chandra Vasu of Bagbazar in Calcutta by young educated Bengalees who were eager for the creation of a native stage and a dramatic literature in their tongue. It

is no wonder, then, that Harachandra Ghosh would be highly influenced by this model of Vidyasundara play before his eyes. The metres which he uses in his poetical lines are borrowed from this school of poetry and some of the thoughts and sentiments are unmistakably from the same source. For example, Rani Chandravali (Portia's mother) thus complains to her husband Raja Vivavara about his apathy in the matter of Bhanumati's (Portia) marriage, who is now of a marriageable age.

শুন শুন মহারাজ, কি কর (তামার কাম,
 নারি তার (নারি লাগ,
 হিতাহিত (দায় কিহু নারি কর গমন।
 গান্ধমতী-তর কন্যা, জন্মে শুনে মধীধন্য,
 মধীতলে নারি খন্য,
 বিবাহের নারি তার কর কোন প্রটনা ॥ &c. &c.

The sentiment above expressed is a very familiar sentiment in Vidyasundara and the metre dirghachatuspadi which is used is a very common metre.

The influence of Vidyasundara is also noticed in the somewhat coarse and indelicate humour which is introduced into the work. It has already been noticed that many new characters have been added to this work and two pairs of such new characters are mainly intended for a humorous purpose. The conventional Vidusaka and his female counterpart were mentioned before. Kalu barber and his shrewish wife Malati form the second pair. An encounter between the husband who is an idler and would not work to provide his wife and children with the bare necessities of life and the infuriated

wife gives an occasion for the display of such coarse wit.

মাননী । তব এমন লেনে জিনে মায় কি?

কাল্প । যিনি কীর দিয়াছেন তানই আশার দিবন ।

মাননী । কীর ত তু মই দিয়াছ । (স তা পাঞ্জা-প্রতিমার-দৃশ্যে) ।

কাল্প । যা নির্মিত !

মাননী । হাঁ- এমন গই যবে, এমন কীর দিত যবে । যা

মনে আছে তা করিব । (মাননীর প্রস্থান)

In third act, Sc. 8th, after Bhanumati and Sushila (Portia and Nerissa) have been respectively married to Chittavilasa and Chitrasena, such a sentiment as the following is put into the mouth of Sushila. It may be observed that it is hardly in good taste according to the modern ^{standard} taste and ill becomes a lady.

সুশীলা । যদি কালি প্রাতঃ আলি বিক্রম করিত উদ্ভূত হয়,
তব আমায় অলম্বন দুটিয়া-সমন-হইব.....

The scene is full of puns and other forms of verbal wit very fashionable in the writings of Bharat Chandra and others and in great vogue at the time, but rather sickening to a modern reader.

We have already discussed the classical elements that are to be found in this production, also such modifications and improvements as have been introduced to harmonise the play with Indian taste. It is not necessary to repeat them. We shall now consider the author's claim that he has tried to retain all that is best in the best passages of the original. Let us take the famous trial scene. Here he tries to translate Shakespeare and the scene is mainly rendered in prose.

Portia's famous speech "The quality of mercy is not strained
 &c" is, however, done in verse. The following is his poetical
 translation of the passage :-

ਦੁਆਰਾ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਸ਼ਿਤ ਹੋਣ।

ਦਧਾਰ ਉਨਰ ਕਰਾ ਬੰਨ ਨਾ ਧਾਧ॥

ਅਸੀਸ ਦਫ਼ਤਰ ਤੋਂ ਜਗਤ ਪ੍ਰਫ਼ਾਰ।

ਸਾਜਨੇ ਅਸੁਰ ਨਾਪ ਅਥਿਤ ਰਿਖਿਅ ॥

গণনাশু ঋতি (যন। স্মৃতি) সত্যিকার।

६ पा-विष्णु- (अथैकं न ३७ अक्षरं नाहं॥

ਦੂਜੇ-ਸ/ਤ ਅੰਤਰ-ਮਾਤਰ ਅਨਿਰਾ

दाता ग्रहीतार भेदे- कल्याण कारित ॥

ਦਫਤਰੀ ਦਸਤਖਤ- ਦਫਤਰੀ- ਪ੍ਰਕਾਸ਼ਿਤ।

ପ୍ରୀତି-ରାଜ୍ୟ (ଦାମ ପ୍ରତି-ରାଜ୍ୟ) ॥

गोकुल (दाइ दया- यदि खोव अरुना।

७ अङ्गुलं मूत्रं शैतं कृत्वा दीप्यमानम् ॥

ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਤਿ ਦੁਰਗਾ ਦੇਵੀ ਦੇਵੀ ਦੇਵੀ ਦੇਵੀ ਦੇਵੀ ।

ଦନ୍ତ ଓଡ଼ିଆ ଅକାଶମାନ ଦନ୍ତ ଓଡ଼ିଆ କବି ।।

।सि.हासन (भा-७- राजा दत्त प्रजा।

কৃষ্ণি | অং হা | অনে (অং হা) দয়াবত্ৰ আসন।

ਦਰ ਅੰਗੀਕਾਰ ਪ੍ਰਕਾ- ਕੇਸਰਿਕ ਤਨ ।

ਅਰਥ ਉਹ ਜੀਵ-ਮਾਨੁਸ਼ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨਿਯੁਤ॥

ଦୟା-ବିଷୟ ଦେହ ମାଣ୍ଡ୍ୟ ଧାବୁର ଶାଜାହାନ ।
 ଦୟାର ଆଦେଶ କାର ବିଷୟର ଗିଫାଟ ॥
 ନାବିକର ତାହା କହି ଡଳ ଅନ୍ଧାରୀ ।
 ଶୁଣିବୁ ଅନ୍ଧାର (ମରି ନାହିଁ ଧୂଳି) ॥
 ଏତଦ୍ଦିନ ଅନ୍ଧାରୀ କର ଅନ୍ଧାରୀ ।
 ଦୟା-ବିନା ହେଲୋକ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ॥
 ମରମରତ ନାନା ମାମା ନାନା (ଲୋକ କର) ।
 ଧାରଣ ତାହା ଶୀର୍ଷ ହେଉ ଧାବୁର ଅନ୍ଧାରୀ ॥
 ଦୟା ହେଉ ଦୀନ ଧୟା ଆଦେଶ ଧୟା ।
 (ହେଉ ମତେ) (ଲୋକ ଦୟା-କର-ଆଦେଶ) ॥
 ଦୟାର ନା-କର ଅନ୍ଧାର (ଦେହର ମାଣ୍ଡ୍ୟ) ।
 ବିଷୟ ଗିଫାଟ ତାହା ନା ଦିଅ ମାଣ୍ଡ୍ୟ ॥
 ହେଲୋକ ଦୟା-ମାଣ୍ଡ୍ୟ ଦୟା କର (ଧୂଳି) ।
 ଧାର (ଲୋକ) ଧୂଳି (ଲୋକ) ଧାର କର (ଧୂଳି) ॥
 ଆଦେଶ-କରିବୁ ଅନ୍ଧାର-ତର (କାହିଁ ମନ) ।
 ଦୟାର ମାଣ୍ଡ୍ୟ-ଆଦେଶ କରିବୁ କର ॥
 ହେଉ ଧୟା ଦୟା-ଧୂଳି ନା ହେଉ ଅନ୍ଧାରୀ ।
 ଧୂଳିର ଧୂଳି ଧୂଳି ମାଣ୍ଡ୍ୟ ଏ ଦୟା ॥
 ମାଣ୍ଡ୍ୟ ବିଷୟ ମତେ ଦିଅ ଆଦେଶ ଧୂଳି ।
 ଧୂଳିର ଧୂଳିର ଧୂଳି-ହେଉ ଦୟା-ଧୂଳି ॥
 କନ୍ୟା କରବୁ ତର ଧୂଳି ତର ॥
 ଧୂଳି ଧୂଳିର ଧୂଳି-କର ମାଣ୍ଡ୍ୟ ॥

The translation, as will be seen, is neither a faithful one nor a good one. The sense of the passage in the main is taken and the trend of the speech is well preserved. The stately music of Shakespeare's blank verse we entirely miss in these rhymed lines, though it must be admitted that the writer is quite an adept in all the various forms of versification that he attempts. Moreover, his poetical lines are more elegant and accomplished than his prose passages and no wonder, for prose-writing was yet a young art in Bengali literature. The following is an example of prose translation in which it will be seen that Shakespeare is more faithfully followed and the sense is better translated :-

Act IV, Scene I, II 89-103 "What judgment shall I dread &c."

ঈর্ষান্বিত, আমি কাহারো-অনিষ্ট-চেষ্টা করিয়া
 * আমন ইচ্ছাভিলাষ করি না, এ-কারণে আমার দেহ মণ্ডে
 কোন দেব দণ্ড বা রাজদণ্ডের শঙ্কা নাই। আমনাম (যে
 বহুতর কীত দাস দাসী-দিগকে গৃহে রাখিয়া-মৃত্যু
 কঙ্করের ন্যায় হেয় করতঃ যদৃচ্ছা-বলে তাহাদের মৃত্যু
 দিয়া-থাকেন, তাহাতে কি আমি করিব (যে ঈর্ষান্বিত,
 অসম্মানিত-দাস দাসী-দিগকে মৃত্যু দিয়া-আমন অজান
 অন্তর্জী-গণের সহিত তাহাদের পারিষদ কলহিত আর
 ভুলি আর বহন দ্বারা তাহারা-যে যত্নদিন অসম্মান
 হইতেছে তাহা মোচন করিয়া-বহু মন পর্য্যটক

১২ শ্রুতি যথার্থ ক্রমানুসারে অসংখ্য অংশে বিভক্ত হইয়া
 যার অর্থের সামান্য ও অর্থোপেক্ষিকরূপে আবিষ্কৃত নিম্নলিখিত
 সুশীতল জ্ঞান ইহা নীতিমূলক ও প্রত্যক্ষ নীতিমূলক (সত্য)
 ও বুদ্ধিবৃত্ত হইবে। ইহাতে কি আশান্বিত হইয়া, যে দাস-
 দাসী-সামান্যের, সামান্য বাহ্য মনে করিবে তাহাই-করিবে।
 (সহ-মত থাকিও করিতেছি যে দশ সহস্র মুদ্রা দিয়া-অর্থিক
 মহামূল্য ক্রয় হয় করিয়াছি (যে অর্থ) (যে নরনার) (যে সামান্য,
 অতীত আমি তাহা নহে ও-এদিকে আমি বাহ্য মনে করিবে
 তাহাই-করিবে। আশান্বিত যদি এই দশা-জ্ঞান না করিলে তাহা
 আশান্বিত সামান্যের অর্থমূল্য হইবে। অতীত (যে সামান্য
 বিচার করিবে কিনা, আমি এই-বিচারসমূহ বিচারে
 দশা-জ্ঞান হই-আমি আশান্বিত বিচার নীতি বিচার করিয়া-
 কখন সামান্য বিচার হইবেক কিনা।

The chief difference between the English language and the Bengali tongue lies in the capacity of the former for condensed expression and the latter's lack of it. Again, this is also one of the distinctions between poetry and prose. It follows, therefore, that prose renderings of the Shakesperian passages in the Indian languages always leave an impression on the mind of being unnecessarily spun out. In poetical translations which, by their very nature, aim at compact and condensed statements according to the ability of the medium employed, this evil is greatly minimised and thus, on the whole, such renderings always appear superior to prose renderings.

At the end of this work in an appendix the author adds

elaborate directions to explain to those who are ignorant of English and English literature, some of the obvious mechanisms of a play. He states that the list of names which is given at the beginning of the book is a list containing the names of the principal characters in the drama. Then he explains that the name which is placed against a speech is the name of the speaker. Such stage directions as "enter", "exit" are next explained. Not only this. He also explains the meaning of such marks of punctuation as ?, , "___", !, (___), ___, which he uses and which are manifestly new in Bengali literature. From this we can very well form an idea of the condition in which Bengali literature was at the time. No doubt, it was the formative period of its modern phase. We quote below this appendix.

পরিশিষ্ট ।

- ইংরেজী-লেখকগণের নামের বাংলা-রূপে ইংরেজী-লেখকগণের নামের বাংলা-রূপে ইংরেজী-লেখকগণের নামের বাংলা-রূপে
- ১। প্রথম প্রকারের (যে) (যে) ব্যক্তি দিলে নাম মাত্রেই
- নির্দিষ্ট হইয়াছে এতদ্বারা ইং-লেখকগণের নামের বাংলা-রূপে
- প্রধানতঃ ক্রমে সংক্ষেপে আলোচনা করিতে হইবে।
- ২। প্রত্যেক ব্যক্তির নামের (যে) (যে) ব্যক্তি দিলে নাম মাত্রেই
- এক এক ব্যক্তির নাম পাঠ্যে নির্দিষ্ট হইয়াছে উক্ত ব্যক্তি
- উক্ত ব্যক্তির উক্তি।

୨। ଜ୍ଞାନ ଜ୍ଞାନ ସଂଗ୍ରହ ଶିକ୍ଷା-କ୍ଷେତ୍ର ଓ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟାଳୟ ଶାନ୍ତି ପ୍ରାପ୍ତିଗ୍ରାମ୍ୟ
ମାନଙ୍କ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟ ପ୍ରାପ୍ତି-କାଳେ "ପ୍ରାପ୍ତି" ଏହି ଶବ୍ଦ ଲିଖିତ ହେଉଅଛି
କାରଣ ଏ ଶାନ୍ତିର ଗାୟନାରେ ଆମର ଦୁର୍ଗତି ହେଉଅଛି।

୪। ଜ୍ଞାନ ଜ୍ଞାନ ସହଜରେ ପାରିଲେ "ସଂହାର" ଏହି ଅର୍ଥ ମିଳିଯିବ
 ହେଲେ ତାହାତେ ତତ୍ତ୍ୱସୂକ୍ଷ୍ମ ବାଟି ଯାଉଛି କି କି ନାହିଁ ତାହା
 ହେତୁ ଚିନ୍ତାଧାରା ହେଲେନ ଚିନ୍ତାଧାରା ଶାନ୍ତିରାମ ।

୧। (?) ଏହି - ସର୍ବ ଚନ୍ଦ୍ରାବୃତ୍ତି (ବିଶାଖାପାଟଣା ଶାସ୍ତ୍ର) (ଏ ଚିତ୍ର
ଅନୁସାରେ ଏହା ଜିଜ୍ଞାସା ପାରିକ, ଏହାପରେ (ଏ ଏ ନାମରେ ଏହି
ଏହି-ଚିତ୍ର ଦୃଷ୍ଟି ରହିବ, ଏ ନାମ ଏହା ଜିଜ୍ଞାସାପତ୍ର ନ୍ୟାୟ ପାରିକାଦି
ରହିବ।

5 | (1) 12 - 15/12/2020 ମାର୍ଚ୍ଚ (15/12/2020) ତାରିଖ ମଧ୍ୟ
 ଶିକ୍ଷକ ଶ୍ରୀ 15/12/2020 ଶିକ୍ଷକ ମାର୍ଚ୍ଚ 22/12/2020

୨। "—" ଏହେ କହୁ ଚିନ୍ତା ଶକ୍ତି (ଅ ପୁଣ୍ୟ ବ୍ୟାପ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି
 ଶା ବାଦ୍ୟ ଶକ୍ତି ଶାକ୍ତିକ ଶେଷ ଶା ଶକ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି
 ମୁକ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି ଶକ୍ତି

୫। (i) ଏ ପଦ୍ଧତିରେ ମଧ୍ୟ ବିଲକ୍ଷଣିତ ଚିହ୍ନ (୧୧) ଓ (୧୨) ଯାହା ମଧ୍ୟ ଧ୍ୟାନ ଦେବାକୁ ପଡ଼ିବ (ମନ ସା. ଶିକ୍ଷା ସା. ଯାହାକି ଯାହାକି ଧ୍ୟାନ କରାଯିବ।

୧। () ଯେ ଯେଉଁଠି ଯେଉଁଠି (ସାଧାରଣ ବା ସାଧାରଣ ସାଧାରଣ)
 ସାଧାରଣ (ସେ-ସେ ବା ସାଧାରଣ ସାଧାରଣ ସାଧାରଣ ସାଧାରଣ-ସା-
 ସାଧାରଣ ସାଧାରଣ ସେ-ସେ ସାଧାରଣ।

[illegible]

This work is, after all, more in the nature of a dramatic poem than of a strict drama, with some infusion of prose speeches. It is mainly composed of long poetical declamations strung together by the thread of the main story. Generally the speeches are long drawn out at the sacrifice of all dramatic propriety and dramatic brevity. Evidently it was meant for the study and not for the stage. It extends over 218 pages.

His next work "Charunukha - Chittahara" is an adaptation of Romeo and Juliet and has the conventional opening of a classical Sanskrit play. It appears that he has by this time found out the inadequacy of the rhyming metres used in his first work for the purpose of conveying Shakespeare's poetry and music and their restrictive influence on his own power of expression. The work is, therefore, mainly in prose. Occasionally songs are introduced here and there and a dialogue is turned into verse. He generally follows Shakespeare in the arrangement of acts and scenes and the main trend of the play and the characters is maintained ; but the Shakesperian situations and incidents, thoughts and sentiments are not always there. As in the case of its predecessor, here also he tries, on his own statement, to preserve as much as possible of the unique charm and wealth of ideas of the original as represented in the best passages but his success here is not much. His prose shows distinct advance in comparison with that used in the first work.

The next production, Susila-Virasimha, an adaptation of Cymbeline by an anonymous writer, is a highly interesting work. The work has its classical features and foreign characters are replaced by Indian characters ; but in the

arrangement of acts and scenes Shakespeare is followed very faithfully. The incidents and situations are similarly closely imitated except when slight changes have been rendered necessary by the introduction of the Indian atmosphere. The author always tries to translate Shakespeare's speeches keeping as much of their thoughts and sentiments as he possibly can. The work, no doubt, falls short of a translation but at the same time it is more than a mere adaptation. The most interesting feature about the work is the first employment of Bengali blank verse in a Shakespearean version. It will be remembered here that this verse is a creation of Michael Madhusudan Datta in the sixth decade of the 19th century and that Michael's first work in it *Tilottama* came out in 1861. The work under notice is a publication of 1868.

Michael Madhusudan's blank verse, like *Minerva*, was born fully panoplied and its conquest of Bengali poetry was effected without much resistance. Mr. R. C. Datta in his *Literature of Bengal* writes "He (Madhusudan) had formed high conceptions of poetry from his deep appreciation of Valmiki and Homer, and he felt within himself a call to imitate the lofty sublimity of these poets. But the jingling of the Bengali rhyme was ill-suited to such attempts" (p.200). He invented his own measure to suit the sublime flights of his poetic imagination and it at once established itself as a matchless instrument for poetic expression.

It is interesting to watch how this adaptation of *Cymbeline* experiments with the new instrument in rendering Shakespeare. He begins with prose and then timidly introduces a

few lines of blank verse in the earlier acts, gradually grows bolder as he finds out the possibilities of it in giving a better version of Shakespeare's thoughts as well as poetry, uses more and more of it as he advances and ends with a marked inclination towards blank verse rendering. In fact, the whole fifth act is in verse where prose is discarded as a poorer medium. The writer exhibits a great knack for turning out really fine blank verse and it is a pity his diffidence prevented him from attempting a real translation in blank verse. Still, his services are not little in one way. He pointed out for the first time in what direction the future of Shakespearean versions in Bengal lay, that they could be accomplished with success only in the newly invented measure. A comparison between his prose passages and poetical passages unmistakably show what an improvement the latter are on the prose and how they supply a very good substitute for the majesty and music of Shakespeare's inimitable poetry. Harachandra Ghosh's jingling rhymes in "Bhanu Mati - Chittavilasa" compared with this author's unrhymed lines at once betray their poverty and inadequacy as an instrument for employment in Shakespearean versions.

As a matter of fact, the few successful Bengali versions of Shakespeare that we possess today have all been carried out in blank verse. It would be idle to pretend that Shakespeare's music could be really transferred to any substitute for his lines, especially when it happens to be in a language so entirely different in genius from Shakespeare's own language. To tell the truth, Shakespeare's music is absent both from Harachandra Ghosh's jingling rhymes as well as from the blank

verse of the more successful authors. But what we find in the latter and miss in the former is a music which in its stateliness and dignity offers the only substitute which could be devised in a medium so foreign to English. And this is all that could be done for poetical versions of Shakespeare's plays in the Indian vernaculars and Bengal is alone fortunate among the Indian provinces in possessing a poetic instrument suitable, in some degree, for the purpose. As far as the personal predilection of the writer of this paper goes, he would ~~place such poetical translations and adaptations, if carried~~ place such poetical translations and adaptations, if carried out with sufficient regard for the preservation of Shakespeare's thoughts and sentiments, above the most faithful prose rendering performed in the chastest prose diction.

Thus it will be seen that Bengal starts with attempting poetical versions of Shakespeare's plays. Harachandra Ghosh experimented with the existing rhyming metres of his day and the result was not very happy. He abandoned verse to a great extent in his second production in 1864. In the meantime, in 1861 Madhusudan sprang upon the country his newly invented blank verse and by his successive productions in the new measure established its claim to a permanent place in Bengali literature. In 1868 the anonymous adapter of *Cymbeline* experimented with this new measure in the domain of Shakespearian versions, with a good deal of trepidation no doubt, but his experiments showed immense future possibilities. Henceforth all poetical versions of Shakespeare have been tried in blank verse and the few successful ones have been achieved in this measure. This anonymous writer deserves the tribute of a pioneer in this respect and his services to Bengal's Shakespeariana will never perish.

Let us give an example of his poetical adaptation. The beauty of ^{the} lines in music, dignity, power of felicitous though inadequate expression of Shakespeare's poetic thoughts, we make no/doubt, will be at once conceded and will reveal the world of advance that they register on the rhymed metres employed in the first Bengali adaptation. The passage quoted below is from Act III., sc. iv., where Pisano divulges to Imogen Posthumus's accusation of her fidelity. Pisano's speeches are omitted.

11. 42-101

সুশীমা। হইলু কৃতঘিণিনী? বঁচি, মাঝী-ভূঁই;

সুশীমা (Imogen)। কি জনা দ্বন্দ্ব নাচিনিনা-কলহিলে যাব
কৃতঘিণি কারে আর আমি প্রভাবনা, মত কি তাই হ'ল?
নাচিনিনা নাচি কোন মহাশয় নারী-কলহে হ'লনা;
কঁদে কঁদে ম'বোলেছে নিনা মোর। পুত্রান রক্ষন
সুপনে দাম্পত্যে মম হ'লোই এখন — নারিক মাদর —
এই-কৃতঘিণি? কুটি কুটি-কারি (ফল এখন মায়ায়।

গোলাপ (Pisano)। পুরুষ-বিশ্বাস রাখ, নারীর বিনাশ!

(গোলাপ।.....)

গোলাপ (Pisano)। কৃতঘিণিনী? বঁচি, মাঝী-ভূঁই;

জনা দ্বন্দ্ব নাচিনিনা-কলহিলে যাব
আর আমি প্রভাবনা, মত কি তাই হ'ল?
কোন মহাশয় নারী-কলহে হ'লনা;
বোলেছে নিনা মোর। পুত্রান রক্ষন
মম হ'লোই এখন — নারিক মাদর —
কুটি কুটি-কারি (ফল এখন মায়ায়।
পুরুষ-বিশ্বাস রাখ, নারীর বিনাশ!

(গোলাপ।.....)

ଅତଃ ଅତଃ ଶ୍ରୀମୁଖେ ଶାନ୍ତି ସଂହାରଣା
 ଶାନ୍ତିମ୍ ଗୋପାଳ ଶାନ୍ତି - ଶାନ୍ତି ଶାନ୍ତି
 ଅତଃ ଅତଃ ପ୍ରକାଶିତ ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍
 ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍ । ଏମ୍, ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍
 ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍ ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍ ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍
 ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍ ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍ - ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍
 ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍ ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍ (ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍
 ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍ ଶ୍ରୀମଦ୍ଭଗବତ୍

The next two productions *Bhranti-vilasa* (The Comedy of Errors) by Pandit Isvar Chandra Vidyasagar and *Susila-Chandra-ketu* (The Twelfth Night) by another Sanskrit scholar can be dismissed lightly. They are prose narrative stories of two Shakesperian plays, more or less inspired by Lamb, rendered in all the purity of a highly Sanskritic diction. *Bhranjajala Kautuka* which follows them is a prose adaptation of a very poor kind. The farcical spirit of the original is ~~xxxxxx~~ imitated rather well. *Amarsimha*, the next production, pretends to be a translation of *Hamlet* with characters and scenes Indianised. In reality, it is an adaptation in which the acts and scenes of the original are faithfully retained but the speeches are mercilessly abridged, the general sense being preserved almost everywhere. There is a mixture of prose and blank verse, the former preponderating and the latter being not of a high quality. As in every other prose version, the spirit and perfume of Shakespeare's poetry is

মরনে নিদ্রায় কিছু নারিক প্রভেদ ।
 নিদ্রায় কুইক যদি, মত মত ক্লেশ
 যায় চানি মন ২৩, মারিলে মানব
 যায়ে যতক ক্লেশ, নারিক মরশ ।
 মর্যাদা-গলি জাক, মরনে মানব,
 মরু(য়) কি এ নিদ্রায়, (মক্শ মূল্য
 (মক্শ দাঁড় মদা, মরজ নিদ্রাত?
 কলিনা-আমরা কিছু মরনের পরে।
 কি দাঁড় মূল্য পরে, নারিক নিশ্চয়,
 এ রিত মত মরশ, মারি মূল্যমান
 এ-কারণে মারি মূল্য, মরজ মূল্যমান
 নতুন দাঁড় মারি, মারি মূল্যমান
 এইকারণে মারি মূল্য, মারি মূল্যমান
 মারি মূল্য মারি, মারি মূল্যমান
 মারি মূল্য মারি, মারি মূল্যমান
 মারি মূল্য মারি, মারি মূল্যমান

The general import of the original passage is caught in the rendering but it is far from being Shakespeare or even an excusable substitute. As a whole, the work makes a very poor show and may be regarded as a failure.

Rudrapala Nataka which was published in the same year as Amarsimha noticed above, is entirely a prose adaptation of Macbeth. The acts and scenes of the original are followed in the main, characters are made Indian and innovations introduced in accordance with the changed atmosphere and setting. Very little of Shakespeare is, however, discovered in the adapted passages, though the language is quite chaste and idiomatic. Here is an example :-

Act I., Scene VII, 11. 1-28.

କାହା ଲେଖିଲେ ଏହି ଶୁଭ ଯାତ୍ରା, ଶିଳ୍ପ ୨ କରାଣେ ଗାୟ । ଦୁର୍ଗା-ରାଜ
 ବନ୍ଧନ, ସମନରେ- ଶେଷ-ଲାଭ-ରାଜ, ଏହିଟିହି ୨ୟ । ଏକ ସୁହୃଦର କାଜି
 କାଜିର ମାତ୍ର - ଶୁଭ ଏହି ପ୍ରାୟଶ୍ଚିତ୍ତ - ପରମାତ୍ମା ଦୁର୍ଗା ମାତ୍ର
 ଦୁର୍ଗା ଦି । କିନ୍ତୁ ଏହି ପ୍ରାୟଶ୍ଚିତ୍ତ ପରମାତ୍ମା ଦୟାଳୁ । ଏ ବିଷ-
 ଅନ୍ୟ କାହିଁ ଦି (ଏହି ବିଷ ଅପମାତ୍ରାଣେ ମିଳିତ ୨ୟ । ଦୁର୍ଗା-ଦେବୀ
 ବାସିନୀ ଦେବୀ ସ୍ୱର ମହତ୍ତ୍ୱ - କିନ୍ତୁ (ଏ କାହା ଶୁଭ ? ଅପମାତ୍ର
 ଆଶ୍ଚର୍ଯ୍ୟ ୩ ପ୍ରଶ୍ନ , ଗାତ ଅପାମି - ଆମି କାହାଙ୍କ ଗାତ
 ବନ୍ଧନ କର, ନା ଆମିହି ଗତ କର ୨ୟ । ଆମି ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦିଷ୍ଟକାରୀ,
 ବିଷୟ- ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦିଷ୍ଟ- କାରୀ, ଆମାତ୍ର ଅତ୍ର ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦିଷ୍ଟ କାରୀ,
 ସୁଧୂରାମାତ୍ର ମହତ୍ତ୍ୱ ମହତ୍ତ୍ୱ ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦିଷ୍ଟ କାରୀ, ମହତ୍ତ୍ୱ ଜନକ ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦିଷ୍ଟ
 କାରୀ - ଏହି-କି (ଏହି ? - ଗାତ ବନ୍ଧନ ଆମି କାହା-୨ୟ -
 ଅଜନନର ବାଜ୍ର, ପ୍ରାୟଶ୍ଚିତ୍ତ ଦେବୀ ବନ୍ଧନ ୨ୟ, କାହିଁ (ମାତ୍ର
 ଆମାତ୍ର ବାଜ୍ର ୨ୟ - ଏହି ୨ୟ, ଏହି - ୬ - ୨ ! ଶୁଭ ଜୟ ୨ୟ ।

Whatever the above passage may be, it is not Shakespeare either in the grandeur of music which we hardly expect here or in the awe-inspiring dignity of thought which it is simply beyond the power of the adapter and which we have a right to expect in what pretends to be a substitute for Shakespeare.

A translation of Macbeth which appears in 1875 is another prose version. It reveals a waste of labour and time by a man who, in trying to give a faithful rendering, translates with such literalness that the language which he employs simply reels under the violence he does to it. The result is a monstrous production which repels and nauseates every Bengali. The usefulness of such a work is hard to see and the boldness of the man borders on nothing short of madness. Let us see how he translates the same passage as the above (Act I., Scene VII, 11 1-28).

যদি তাই করা হইত, যা কলীন করা হয়, শিখু কলিলে
 জান হয়; এই গোপন হওয়ায় যদি ইহাও কলা-কলাক-সম্বন্ধ-
 করিত, আর তাঁহার নিবৃত্তিও ইচ্ছা-সিদ্ধি প্রাপ্ত হইতাম; (য-এই
 আম-ভরে- সমুদয় শেষ হইত, আর সমুদয় এই ক্ষণেই
 (শেষ হইত) পরিত, কিন্তু এই-মুহুর্তে *কালের এই-কিঙ্কর
 এবং কলাবিশীল মুহুর্তে, আম-ও-বিশিষ্ট কীমতের সৌন্দর্য-প্রবৃত্ত-
 হই। — কিন্তু এ-সকল বিষয়, আম-এই মুহুর্তে-দড়া-
 প্রাপ্ত হই; (য-কিহা-এই কীমতের কার্যের শিক্ষাদান-দিয়ে,
 সম্বন্ধ, শিক্ষাদান প্রাপ্ত হওয়া-য়, (এই সমুদয়-কীমতের বিরুদ্ধ-কর
 হইল) পুনরাগমন করে; এই মুহুর্তে-কিঙ্কর-বিশিষ্ট-সমুদয়
 দ্রুত-সকল আম-দিগের শিউ ৩(৩০-২০)ন করিতে তুলিয়া
 দিয়া থাক। ৫. ৫.

It is perfectly sickening to go through a passage like this for it makes no sense at all. English sentences are kept in their order and Bengali words are merely substituted

for English words. The result is neither English nor Bengali. As a matter of fact the author has precious little acquaintance with his own tongue as the gross spelling mistakes show. Not a single sentence in the above passage is a Bengali sentence. Idiocy could not be carried further. Then he adds voluminous footnotes, which provide further torture. For example, it will be seen in the above passage that there is an asterisk against the word কালর and in the footnote we find

*Upon this bank &c.- বর্তমান বঙ্গাক কবি

এটি সুন্দর কাল কালের মতো মনুষ্যের তীর এবং চাঁদ বালিয়া
বসন করিয়াছেন; উভয় দূত এবং অমিত্য কালক তাহাতে
মঙ্গল করিয়াছেন, এবং দূত কালক তঁর তীর এবং চাঁদক
কমলাঃ শ্রাম করিতেছে, এবং অমিত্য কালের প্রতি-বর্তমান
হইতেছে এবং কাল বসন্ত অমিত্য কালের জন্য কমলাঃ
দলিয়া থাকিতেছে দূত কাল মঙ্গল হইতেছে।

Thus in connection with this passage, notes on 'Jump', 'Commend' 'Pity like a naked babe', 'which overleaps itself' &c. abound. It is useless to multiply instances. It is an extremely idiotic and insane production and an astounding example of how a perfectly literal translation in the Indian vernaculars can be made equally unintelligible. Some sense can be gleaned from it only if we keep Shakespeare's pages constantly open before our eyes and read his line before we take up a corresponding line in the translation.

Bhima Simha is a prose adaptation of Othello. Shakespeare is followed in acts and scenes and in the story with necessary changes due to Indianisation of ^{the} play. There

is one important added element in the adaptation. In the original it is difficult to see what really inspired Iago's malice against Othello. It may be his disappointment at the preferment conferred on Cassio or the unjust thought that Othello had illicitly known his wife. Sometimes it seems that it is the ingrained perfidy of Iago's diabolical nature. A new motive is, however, introduced into this adaptation and that ^{is} Iago's (Bhairava's) infatuation for Desdemona (Svarnalata) which is made highly pronounced. Iago in the original (Act II., Scene I, L. 303) confesses his love for her but that is not in the way of lust. Here this is accentuated and is made one of the strong motive forces of his hatred of Othello. The author uses blank verse in rare instances - one such passage being Othello's defence of himself against the charge of using sorcery for winning Desdemona's love. The adapter merely attempts to catch and reproduce the sense of Shakespearean passages. No attempt is made to reproduce the thoughts and sentiments of Shakespeare either in their entirety or in their beauty of expression.

The next prose adaptation Madanmanjari (The Winter's Tale) takes all sorts of liberties with Shakespeare. Its classical features have already been noticed. Shakespeare's story is handled in a free and easy manner by the adapter. The arrangement of the acts and scenes in the original is not followed and the disposition of incidents and situation is disregarded. The crudeness of the work is apparent from the very first scene which acquaints us with the fact of the groundless jealousy to which King Chandrasekhara (Leontes) has fallen a victim. In Shakespeare we see the very birth of

this jealousy and its subsequent growth in a lifelike manner till Leontes has his reason entirely clouded by it. Here we are merely told about it. The audacious and delightful figure of the rogue Autolycus is missing here. The intensely dramatic way in which Hermione, in the original, is brought back to life and restored to her repenting husband and her miraculously returned daughter is absent from this production. There are other like instances where the dramatic movement of the play is similarly and wantonly crippled. On the whole, the adaptation is hardly Shakespeare - no attempt is made in it to retain Shakespeare's thoughts and sentiments and in their place we are treated to the adapter's very mediocre imitation of conventional classical fancies and very crude independent working out of the plot.

Buralata Nataka which is an adaptation of ^{^The} Merchant of Venice is decidedly a superior production in comparison with all its predecessors. The work is carried out in a mixture of prose and verse, the former predominating. The verse employed, it should be noticed, is blank verse. The author strictly observes Shakespeare's dramatic arrangement in respect of acts and scenes and the attempt is made to translate as often as possible and as faithfully as the author can. There is no doubt a good deal of abridgement and omission but it is always regarding passages which are difficult of retention in consideration of an Indian atmosphere introduced or the different genius of the language of translation. For instance, the humour of Launcelot (Satyuke) as represented in his malapropos is very difficult to retain and is very wisely omitted, though the comic nature of the character is otherwise maintained. Let us give some instances of both prose and poetical translations from this work. It will be noticed what distinct improvement it marks

on Harachandra Ghosh's attempt in Bhanumati-Chittavilasa.

The following is the blank verse rendering of the famous passage "The quality of mercy is not strained &c."

ନିରାଶ୍ରମ ଦୟା-ପ୍ରଦ ସହୃଦ୍ୟ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତି !
 ତୁମ୍ଭ ସତେ ସୁଦୃଢ଼ ମନ ବିନ୍ଦୁ ଗଡ଼ିଲେ
 ସମାଧି ଏ-ପିଣା ସମାଧି କାନ୍ଦାନ୍ତି;
 ଚିତ୍ରର ସ୍ଵାସୀନ ସୂତି ଦୟା (ସେ ମତ
 ଦୀନ ଦୁଃଖୀ-ଜାଣେ ସାମ୍ୟେ ପାଶ ଦେଖିଲେ।
 ଦ୍ଵିବିଧି ଶୃଙ୍ଖଳ ହେଲେ ସହ ମହାଦାନ;
 ଦାତା (ତାହା ପାଏ ତାହା ମଧ୍ୟ ଶୁଦ୍ଧକଳ।
 ମହାବଳ ବ୍ୟାକାନ୍ତ ସିଦ୍ଧିର ମନ୍ତ୍ର
 ମାଳିକ ଦୟାର (ସ୍ରାବ ଶାନ୍ତ ମତ୍ତରେ।
 କନକ କିରୀଟ କିମ୍ବା ଦୁର୍ଘାତିର ଖଳେ
 ଦୟା-ପ୍ରଦ ଯଦି ମିଳୁ ନହେ ନୂଆମାନି!
 ହୃଦୟ ମିଶ୍ରାମନ - ହିସିକା ବିକ୍ରମ-
 ସିନାପ୍ରଭା ଶୁଭାଶ୍ରାଦି, ବିଶାଳେନ
 ଧର ମହତ୍ତ୍ଵ ସାଧୀର ଦୟା-ପ୍ରଦିବିତ୍ଵେନ।
 ଶିଶୁ-ଦୟା ସହ ଯଦି ଧାର୍ଯ୍ୟ ଦୟାବତ୍ତେ,
 ପ୍ରଦାନେ ନରପାତି ମୁକ୍ତପାତି ମଧ୍ୟ।
 କର ସର୍ବଜନ ଏବଂ ବିଚାର ସମାଜ
 ସୁଖ ସୁଖ-କ୍ଷମା ବଳ ପାଠେ ପାଠେନ?
 ଗର୍ଭଣା କି ଦୟାତର ହେବ ପରକାଳେ,
 ସେ-କାଳେ ଯଦି ଜୀବ ଦୟା-ନା କରিলେ?
 କାହିଁକି ଏତ କଥା, ନିରାଶ୍ରିତ ତର
 ବିଚାର । ପିପାସା ହେନ ସତ ନିଦାନେ।
 ବିଚାରେ ସମସ୍ତ ହୁଏ ପାର ବିକାଶିତ
 କ୍ଷମା ଏବଂ ମତ ଓହ୍ଲେ ଶାନ୍ତି ନନ୍ଦନେ।

A free translation of the passage is the above and a very good one too. Without any doubt, the lines are more dignified both in music and movement than the jingling rhyming lines used in Bhanumati Chittavilasa. His prose is similarly more polished, refined and poetic than the prose of Harachandra Ghosh. Here is an instance :- (Act V, Scene 1, "How sweet the moonlight sleeps upon this bank &c. ll. 54-65)

ଧାନ୍ୟ ! । ପ୍ରିୟେ, ଶାନ୍ତିତେ କ୍ରୋଧୁ ନୀ କମନ ମୁଖେ ବିଗ୍ରହ କରେ, ଦୟା !
 ଏମ ଏକାମେ ସମ ଏକତ୍ତେ ମାନ ଧନି ; ଏକମ ନିଷ୍ପତ୍ତି ଶାନ୍ତ ମନ୍ଦିତ ଧନ
 ମିଶ୍ରି-ଲାଗେ । । ପ୍ରିୟେ ସମା ! (ଡେଉଡ଼େ ଡେଉଡ଼େ) ଦୟା ଦାୟି,
 ମନନ ମନ୍ତନ କ୍ରମେ ଏକତ୍ତେ ଏକାମେ ବହୁ ମାଳାୟ ବିହ୍ନିତ ! ଏହି
 ମନନ ନୟନ ମନ୍ତନ ଏକତ୍ତେ ଏକାମେ ସୁଖୀୟ ମନ୍ଦିତର ମୁଖାମୁଖ
 ଏକାମିତ ଧନ । କିନ୍ତୁ ମନୁଷ୍ୟର ଆଦେଶର ଆଦେଶ ୩ ଦେଶ
 ମୁଖାତରମି - ଏକାମିତ ଧନ , କିନ୍ତୁ ଏକଦିନ ଏହି ନୟନ ମୁଖାତରମି
 (ଦୟା ଦାୟିକ ମନ୍ତନର ମନ୍ତନ ଉପଦିନ ଆମର ଏହି
 ଏକତ୍ତେ ମନ୍ଦିତ ଧନ ଦାୟିନେ ।

Act III, Scene II, in which Bassanio makes his choice of the caskets is mainly done in verse and it is so creditably performed that we can hardly refrain from quoting another instance. The following is the rendering of Portia's opening speech "I pray you, tarry : pause a day or two &c."

ଏକ ଦିନ ଦୂର ନାହିଁ ! ଏକ ମନ ମିନତି,
 ମୁଖିତ ମନ୍ତନାମେ ; କାନି କିନ୍ତୁ ମି
 ଏକାମିତ ଏକ ଦାୟି ବିହ୍ନିତ ବିହ୍ନି,
 ଏକ ନା ପାରିତ ଏକ ଦୟା ଦାୟି ।
 କି-କାନି କାନିତ ବିହ୍ନି ଏକତ୍ତେ ଆମର—

ହାୟ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଯାଏ ନାହିଁ କିମ୍ଭାବେ —
 (ମ ଗୋ ନହେ ଗୋସାଇଁ । — ତବେ କି ବିଶେଷ ? —
 ଓହ୍ଲେ ଗୋସାଇଁ କଥା ହାତେ ଗୋସାଇଁ (ହେ କଥା ?
 ଯାଦି ନା ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ପାଦେ ଗୋସାଇଁ,
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ହାତେ ଦାସୀ (ଗୋସାଇଁ ମାତେ ଦୁଇ;
 କିନ୍ତୁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ! ନାହିଁ ପାଦେ ଗୋସାଇଁ —
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ —
 କି ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ?
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ;
 ହାୟ ! ନା ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ।
 କିନ୍ତୁ ଯାଦି ଦେବ ଗୋସାଇଁ ନା ପାଦେ ଗୋସାଇଁ
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ହାତେ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ, (ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ)
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ
 (ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ;
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ — ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ —
 (ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ — ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ।
 ହାୟ କି ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ! ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ
 ନା ପାଦେ ଗୋସାଇଁ (ଗୋସାଇଁ ! ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ! ନାହିଁ ଦାସୀ ଗୋସାଇଁ;
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ।
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ — ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ;
 ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ (ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ଗୋସାଇଁ ।

The next production Ajaysimha-Vilasavati is a prose adaptation interspersed with songs. Like its predecessor Charu-Mukha-Chittahara it is not much of a success. The author in the preface declares that even the most learned can not hope to translate Shakespeare so successfully as to retain the charm of his divine writings. He, moreover, remarks that those who have read Shakespeare in the original will find the work insipid. We have no reason to find fault with this self-judgment. The story of Romeo and Juliet is there, but there is no Shakespeare.

The next work Chandranath is ostensibly an adaptation of Hamlet but it is not so. The story is, no doubt, somewhat like the story in Hamlet. It is the story of a King who has killed his elder brother, consigned his nephew to a watery grave and has usurped the throne. The nephew miraculously escapes his fate and regains his lawful throne on the violent death of the usurper. This nephew who evidently represents Hamlet, however, plays a very insignificant part in the play and the work under notice is thus a typical Hamlet without the part of the Prince in it. It is significant that the version is named after Chandranath (Claudius) and not after Hamlet, Chandranath between one murder and another has fits of repentance and while in the grip of it commits more murders until he ends his bloody career by committing suicide. Unmeaning butchery is heaped in the play and that seems to be the author's conception of tragedy. In the preface the author takes care to excuse himself for writing a tragedy against the tradition of the Indian drama and if the model supplied by him of a tragedy were the usual type of tragic drama, the

world could not be too grateful to the Hindu critics for prohibiting the writing of tragic plays. Shakespeare will surely writhe in his grave if he could know that a production like this could even remotely claim any kinship with his immortal work.

"Othello" is the title of the next Bengali version, though the characters in it are all made Indian. It is a very curious production in many ways, and it professes to be a translation which, as will be seen, it is not. It is not even an adaptation. Its story has some resemblance to the story of Othello and that is perhaps the only link between it and Shakespeare's great tragedy. But the author tries to palm it off as a translation and his audacity takes one's breath away. In many respects, as will be presently made clear, it is an unashamed forgery - the only instance of its kind in Bengali.

In the preface the author starts by giving a perfectly cock-and-bull story. He states there that the translation is made from Shakespeare's Othello and from a French dramatic poem of the same name by a French poetess named Lucy. He is careful to inform us that the portions taken from these two dramatists are severally indicated in the body of the play as belonging to Shakespeare or Lucy. Then he goes on :- "The great French biographer " (Mandeville ?) in his life of Shakespeare mentions that the French poetess Lucy who was contemporaneous with Shakespeare was on terms of the greatest intimacy with the English poet and they used to write plays on the same subjects, the number of which is pretty large. This poetess wrote also a dramatic poem called Othello

at the same time that Shakespeare wrote his great tragedy. There was an understanding between the two about this and on the completion of her work the French lady dedicated it to Shakespeare. Lucy's poem was published with a criticism of it written by Shakespeare himself in which Shakespeare gave the palm to the rival production. This highly interesting literary fact, the writer avers, was brought to his notice by a friend of his who happened to possess a copy of Lucy's poem (a highly worn out copy ! - he takes care to inform us) and the fictitious document was also translated for his benefit by this fictitious friend.

Here is something for future biographers of Shakespeare and for future Shakesperian critics to learn and note ! It is impossible to see the idea underlying this mendacious story and this invention of a poem which does not exist and from which portions of translation are purported to be given. And this also in the last decade of the 19th century ! For this work was published in 1894. As has been remarked, the acts and scenes in this so-called translation are clearly marked as "from Lucy" or "from Shakespeare" to indicate their source. As far as the Shakesperian portions are concerned, on comparison it is found that they have as little obligation to Shakespeare as the other passages have to Lucy that French lady of the translator's fertile invention. The story of Othello also undergoes a good deal of alteration. Indira (Desdemona) is the daughter of a king Satrajit (Brabantio). There are two suitors for her hands, Visvajit (Othello) and Jitajit (Roderigo). The first two acts represent a conflict between these two lovers and Satrajit is persuaded by his wife

Jayavati, Indira's stepmother, to favour the suit of Jitajit. Queen Jayavati plays a leading part and in a manner dominates the whole play. In the 4th act Visvajit succeeds in marrying Indira in spite of the opposition of her stepmother who is overridden by the king who gives his consent to the union. But troubles are not yet ended. Indira is thrown into the prison and held captive in a lonely island and Visvajit is exiled. In an improvised canoe Visvajit manages to cross the seas to the island of Chaitak (Cyprus) where Indira lives imprisoned and becomes reunited to her. Soon reconciliation between them and Indira's parents takes place. Now begins the complication of jealousy which is fomented by Siddhinath (Tago) and the story ends as in Shakespeare. Even here one atrocity is perpetrated by this self-important translator. Siddhinath is involved in the exile of Visvajit and on his banishment he is promoted to take the place of Visvajit as General. The author allows Visvajit to be duped by this creature who was not, as in Shakespeare, a secret enemy, but an open and declared one as proven by his complicity in the banishment of Visvajit. Altogether, the work under notice, in spite of its pretensions and inventions, is a crude and immature production of impossible and puerile situations. It would be a great injustice to Shakespeare to connect it in any way with his name. The only word of commendation that can be uttered about it is that forgery is perhaps the highest tribute the ignoble spirit can pay to the highest and the purest and in its completeness as such a form of flattery, it leaves nothing to be desired.

The same year a translation of Hamlet came out from the pen of one Chandiprasad Ghosh. As befits a translation, the

characters in it are the original characters, the acts and scenes, situations and incidents are faithfully copied and the speeches are supposed to be a rendering of the original speeches. In this last respect, the poor nature of the work is painfully evident. In translating a particular passage the author always shows ~~the~~ the very irritating knack of leaving out what is best in the passage. It seems that he is not properly equipped for the task - ~~he~~ hacks the speeches without any compunction merely because he is unable to tackle them. He uses not the regular blank verse which is associated with the name of Madhusudan and which has attained a classical standard in Bengali, but that free variety of it which Girishchandra introduced for purposes of dramatic composition. After all, the work is wholly disappointing and does not deserve any commendation.

The next year is memorable year in the history of Bengal's Shakespeariana. In this year Hemchandra, one of the greatest of Bengali poets, accomplished his adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*. We have already quoted his valuable preface to this work in which he discusses the propriety of adaptations as against translations of foreign works in Bengali. As we have seen he is not against translations but he was at the time doubtful of their favourable reception by the reading public in Bengal and he was deliberately of the judgment that the way to them must be prepared by suitable adaptations. His judgment was undoubtedly right.

Hemchandra's great work sets the model for what a Shakespearian adaptation in India should be. It is not, as

other adaptations with rare exceptions are, a new play on a theme taken from Shakespeare worked out independently and trying to pass itself off as Shakespeare which it hardly is. Except for the changes made in the names of the dramatic personae, some alterations in situations and slightly new arrangement of acts and scenes and such other modifications as are made compulsory by the Indianisation of the play, Shakespeare is as faithfully reflected in this work as it is in the power of the Bengali tongue to do. In the main Shakespeare is translated in blank verse and of the inimitable beauty, charm and grace of the translation it is hardly possible to speak too much. It also appears rather difficult to make selections of illustrative passages from this work, for almost any passage can stand as a model. However, some instances are culled below and anybody acquainted with the Bengali tongue and Bengali literature will readily admit their ineffable beauty not only as a fine specimen of Bengali literature but also as the ablest rendering of Shakespeare in all his graces of poetry, thoughts and sentiments.

Thus are rendered the lines in which the first exchange of love between Romeo and Juliet takes place and is sealed with a devout kiss. It will be noticed that the lines in the original rhyme and a corresponding rhyming metre of the greatest suitability is used by Hemchandra, Act I., sc. v. 1197-1211.

শ্রীমৎ ১। স্বামী,

কল্যাণ মানিক ২২ ইশ্বর হুঁই (৫) (২২)

ହୁଁ(ଏ) ଯଦି ଏକ ସ୍ଵର୍ଗେ ଶୁଣି ଯାଆନ୍ତି ନାହିଁ ।

ସ୍ଵର୍ଗ ସର୍ବସ୍ଵେନ ଦୋଷ (ଏହିପରି ଶୁଦ୍ଧାତ୍ମା ଗୋଷ୍ଠି
ସର୍ବତ୍ର ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ଚିତ୍ତ କର ସମୁଦାୟ) ॥

ହୁଁ(ଏ) ଯଦି । କର ନାହାନ୍ତି ଶୁଣି, କର କରା ଅପମାନ,

କର ଅନ୍ୟ ଶୁଦ୍ଧାତ୍ମା ଶୁଣି ଶୁଣି ।

କର ହୁଁ(ଏ) ହୁଁ(ଏ) ନିହିଁ କର ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ

(ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ଶୁଦ୍ଧାତ୍ମା) ॥

ହୁଁ(ଏ) ଯଦି । କର ନାହିଁ ଶୁଦ୍ଧାତ୍ମା ଶୁଣି ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ, ନାହିଁ

ସମାଜ ତରଳ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ?

ହୁଁ(ଏ) ଯଦି । ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ - ଶୁଦ୍ଧାତ୍ମା ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ

ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ - ଶୁଦ୍ଧାତ୍ମା - ଶୁଦ୍ଧାତ୍ମା ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ।

ହୁଁ(ଏ) ଯଦି । ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ

(ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ - ଶୁଦ୍ଧାତ୍ମା - ଶୁଦ୍ଧାତ୍ମା ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ) ॥

ହୁଁ(ଏ) ଯଦି । ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ

ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ - ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ - ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ।

ହୁଁ(ଏ) ଯଦି । ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ

(ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ - ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ - ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ) ॥

It will be seen that even the trick of puns which Shakespeare uses in the passage is very well imitated in lines 5-8. Of course, the imagery of Christian saints and palmers and their practices could not be kept as alien ideas and usages but a very good substitute for them is found and the adapted passage is quite worthy of the original.

Let us take another passage which is rhymed in imitation of the original. It is the Friar's speech in Act II., sc.iii.,ll.65-80, which is a mixture of surprise and banter, dignified no doubt, at the light-o'-love character of young men. The original lines are very expressive of this mixture of feelings and the movement of the lines exactly echoes the sense. The same may be said with truth of the translation.

একি-একি-ও তোমারি - একি বিপর্যয়!

একি কি সে মনোরমা আর এক নয়

এত দিন আর প্রাণে ছিলে ক্ষুদ্র প্রাণ!

যুবাকর প্রাণবাসী নয়নের দমা,

নহে তোরা হৃদয়ের মর্জিতলে (নয়)!

হরি হরি! কত মন লবনীত লন,

ওমায়ে দিয়াছে যার প্রাণ প্রতল,-

ଏ ଧରଣେ ଏବେ କିନ୍ତୁ ନାହିଁ କିନ୍ତୁ ଧୂଳି ଧାଉଁ—

ଏ ଗାଁ ବନ୍ଧୁଙ୍କ ଗାରି ବୁଝା (ମନ, ହାତ)!

ସାଧୁତେ ଛାଡ଼ାଏ ଥିଲେ — "ଆ ହୋମ" ଯେ

ଏବେ ପାରିଲେ ଆଜି କରୁଛି ନିର୍ମଳ!

(ମି ନିଷାମ ବୁଝେ ଧୂଳି ଆକାଶେ ଯେ ଶବ୍ଦ)

ଆଜି ଧୂଳିରେ ନାହିଁ ଦେବ ହୃଦୟାଳୀ!

କାନ୍ଦେ ଆଜି "ଐଁ ଐଁ" କରେ "ଐଁ ଐଁ" ଶବ୍ଦ ଯେ

ଆଜି ମହତ୍ତ୍ୱେ ଲେଖା — (ମୋଟେ କଥା ଖାଣ୍ଡେ)!

(ମତେ ଯଦି ତୁମି 23 — ଏ ଧୂଳି ବିଳାସ)

"ପ୍ରାଣେ ବାନ୍ଧିବି" ତେ କହୁଥିଲେ କାଳ;

ତେ କି ମେ ତୁମି ନଃ — ଶବ୍ଦରେ ନିଷ୍ଠା—

ଏରି-ମାତ୍ରେ ଉଜ୍ଜ୍ୱଳା ମେ ମଣ୍ଡିତ ଅନନ୍ତ!

ପୁରୁଷ ଏତେ ଯଦି ଶିବରାମ ମାର,

ଆମିଲେ ନାହିଁ ମନ ଆତ୍ମା କିନ୍ତୁ ତେ!

Notice how beautifully the following translation is
executed (Act I., sc.11., ll. 2-25) :-

କିମ୍ଭେ 3 ଶବ୍ଦ — ଏହି ବାଗ୍ୟମାନେ!

ଅହୋ ! ପୁରୁଷମାନେ ଏହି, ଧୂଳିରେ ଶାନ୍ତ

ଶୁଣି ଦିବ୍ ଆମୋ କରି — କାଳେ ଯିବିବି ।
 ଓଡ଼ିଆ ଶବ୍ଦ-ସାଧୀ ମଧ୍ୟ, ନାମୋ ବିଜ୍ଞାନାଥ,
 ଏହି (ମେ) ପାଞ୍ଚୁର କହେବେ ଶବ୍ଦ ।
 କାଳେ ଯିବିବି ତ — ଦ୍ଵିଷ୍ଟେ ଆତ୍ମାହିନ ।
 ଓ ଶାଶୀ କି ଲାବଣ୍ୟେ ଓଷମା ଗ୍ରାସାର,
 ଅବତର (କ୍ରୋଧ) ହଟାନ୍ତେ କାହା ପାର?
 ଅନ୍ୟ ଅନ୍ୟ କାଳେ ଦୁଇଟି କେଶରୀ ।
 ଯଦି, ଯିବିବି କାଳେ ତା ଯଦି! — କି ବ୍ୟବସ୍ଥା?
 କହି- କିହୁବେତନ! — ନାହିଁ (ହାତ) ଧନ,
 ଫଳେ ଫଳେ କହୁବେତନ କହା କହା ଧନ,
 ଆମେ ଓ ଓଡ଼ିଆ ଦେଶ (କାଳେ) ଗ୍ରାସାର ।
 ଯଦି ଦୁଃଖୀ ଆମେ, ଆମେ ମହାଶୟି
 ଯେନାତ କାଳେ କହା ଧନ ଗ୍ରାସାର!
 ଆମେ, କିମ୍ବା ଧନ ଦୁଇଟି, ଯାହା କି ଓଡ଼ିଆ!
 ଆକାଶେ ତାହା ଧନ ଧାର ଆମେ କହା
 ତାହା ଓ ଦୁଇଟି ଧନ — (ହାତ) ଧନ ବଳା,
 ଶବ୍ଦେ (କ୍ରୋଧ): କିହୁବେତନ ଆମେ କହା ଧନ
 (ଧନ) ଧନ ନା ଯିବିବି ଆମେ! କିତା ତାହା
 (ଧନ) ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ,
 (ଧନ) — ଧନ ଦୀନ ଦିଶା ଆମେ କହା ।
 ଏ ଧନ-ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ-ଧନ-ଧନ
 (କ୍ରୋଧ): ଧନାଧିପା ଧନ ଆକାଶେ ଧନ,
 ଏ (ଧନ) ଧନ ଆମେ ଧନ ନାତାଳନ ।
 ମହାଶୟି ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ମହାଶୟି
 କାଳେ କାଳେ ଧନ-ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ।
 ଆମେ! (ଧନ) ଧନ କିମ୍ବା କାଳେ ଧନ
 ମହାଶୟି କାଳେ ଧନ, (ଧନ) ଧନ ଧନ
 ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ କାଳେ ଧନ ଧନ
 ମହାଶୟି ଧନ ଧନ ଧନ ।

Take the lines 85-135 from the same scene:-

દુનિયા ૧ । આમિનીં અમકાર લોકજી રદન,
 ના પાડી નામિતિ કરે - નામકાર નામકાર
 બાજીજી રૂઢે રૂઢ-રૂપાન શીવાય,
 અનભર દારે (અન મત પૂરે યાવ) ।
 (બાજી મૂલ્ય રૂઢ ના રૂપાદિ રૂઢ રૂપા -
 દિશ્યુ કિશ્યુ અથે અનિભ (મયર
 રદન રૂપના કાઠિ રૂપિયા - ના ના ।
 અમ અમકાર મય, અમના-અમ
 રૂપાદિ ! અમના - બારિના અમ રૂઢ
 મિથ્યા એક અમકાર, અમીક એક
 રૂઢ-રૂઢ ! - રૂપા (અમકાર રૂપામય ?
 રૂપાદિ-રૂપા - રૂપાદિ-રૂપા - મિથ્યા રૂપામય ।
 અમકાર અમકાર અમ અમકાર અમકાર
 કિ રૂપા અમકાર અમકાર અમકાર (અમકાર ?
 અમકાર અમકાર અમકાર, રૂપા અમકાર -
 અમકાર અમકાર અમકાર અમકાર (અમકાર) ।

શિવ ૩ । એ રૂપા અમકાર રૂપા રૂપા રૂપા
 અમકાર અમકાર અમકાર, રૂપાદિ રૂપા
 અમકાર અમકાર, રૂપાદિ રૂપા
 અમકાર અમકાર અમકાર -

શુ ૧ । ના ના, જા રૂપા ના,
 ૩ રૂપા - મિથ્યા રૂપા રૂપા અમકાર અમકાર,
 રૂપા મિથ્યા નામકાર રૂપા -

શિવ ૧ । કિશ્યુ અમકાર, કિશ્યુ અમકાર ।

ଶ୍ରୀ । କିହୁଁ ନା-

କିହୁଁ ଏହି କଥା ଦିଅ - କଥା ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ,
ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ ଆଗରୁ ଏହା ହୁଏ ନାହିଁ,
ତୋହାରେ ମୁଁ ଜାଣି ଏହା ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ ।

ଆ । ଏହି - ମଧ୍ୟ ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ ଆଗରୁ ହୁଏ -

ଶ୍ରୀ । ଏହା ଏହା

ମଧ୍ୟ କିହୁଁ ଏହା ହୁଏ ଏହା ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ ।
ଏହା ନାହିଁ ଏହା ନାହିଁ ମୁଁ ନାହିଁ ନାହିଁ;
ଏହା ହୁଏ ଏହା ହୁଏ ମୁଁ ହୁଏ କିହୁଁ
ଏହି ତୋହା ଏ କଥା ନା, ତୋହା ନା ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ,
ନାମ୍ଭଙ୍କ ନାହିଁ ମଧ୍ୟ - ଏହା ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ
ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ (ନାମ୍ଭଙ୍କ ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ ହୁଏ ନାହିଁ) ଏହା !
ଏହି - ମଧ୍ୟ ଏହା ଏହା, କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ !
ମୁଁ ହୁଏ, ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ କିହୁଁ ନାହିଁ ଏହା -
ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ ଏହି ତୋହା ଏହି ଏହା ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ
ଏହା ହୁଏ ମୁଁ ହୁଏ ଏହା, ଏହା ମୁଁ ହୁଏ
ଆମ୍ଭଙ୍କ ଏହି ନାମ୍ଭଙ୍କ - କିହୁଁ ଏହା ।

ଆ । କିହୁଁ, ଏହା ହୁଏ ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ?

ଶ୍ରୀ । ଏହା ହୁଏ କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ - କିହୁଁ - କିହୁଁ ?

ଆ । ଏହା କିହୁଁ ଏହା ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ?

ଶ୍ରୀ । ନା - ଏହି କିହୁଁ ଏହା ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ
ଏହା - ଏହା - କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ?

ଆ । କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ? ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ?

ଶ୍ରୀ । ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ -

ଏହା କିହୁଁ, ଏହା କିହୁଁ ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ?

ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ?

ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ?

ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ଏହା କିହୁଁ କିହୁଁ ?

This immortal scene of romantic youthful love in all its abandon and heedlessness of impediments, in all its confessions and maidenly reserve and coyness, in its odour and freshness of a newly budded rose is rendered in a worthy manner by this great Bengali poet. A true poet's heart he possessed, and this enabled him to transfer so much of Shakespeare's beauty to his pages. No less is the credit of the language which in less than a hundred year's culture could mould itself such a perfect instrument for human expression. It is said that when Madhusudan first conceived the idea of writing blank verse in Bengali, a friend expressed his fear that such an experiment might not suit the genius of the language. Madhusudan merely replied "Nothing is impossible for a daughter of Sanskrit."

It is difficult to resist the temptation of quoting passage after passage from this admirable version, but the consideration of space forbids it. Let us see how that wonderful description of Queen Mab's fairies in Act I, Sc IV, fares in this adaptation. Of course Queen Mab is rechristened in the Indian way and she is " $\sqrt[n]{\frac{1}{n} \mid \frac{1}{n} \mid \frac{1}{n}}$ " one of the Indian sprites.

[illegible]

[illegible]

The above is a very difficult passage to adapt for the fairies over whom Queen Mab presides as the mistress and whose various pranks are related here are unknown in India. So a race of mischievous sprites with an appropriate queen has got to be invented and some of their characteristics and pranks must be suited to Indian conditions. This is very wonderfully done here and the spirit of the original is very faithfully caught and conveyed.

Reference has already been made to some of the changes in scenes made to the demands of Indian customs. Scene III., Act V, is thus a scene of ^{an} crematorium. A very powerful picture of it is drawn by the poet in all its grim and loathsome properties of burning, burnt, or half-burnt dead bodies. This of course is entirely an innovation and has nothing to do with Shakespeare. But Shakespeare is considerably there and very exquisitely rendered too. Take for example Romeo's cry of anguish over Juliet's dead body, "O my love ! my wife ! etc." Just before he drinks the poison and puts an end to himself.

ଆମ ଆନନ୍ଦିକ ଆତ୍ମା ! ଆମ ଶକ୍ତି ମୟ ।

ଆମ ସତ୍ତା ଏ ନିଷ୍କାମ-ନିୟମ

ଅନ୍ତେ ତୋ ମନେ ନାହିଁ (ନ ମୋତେ ମୋତେ !

କୁଣ୍ଡଳ (ଜାଣନ୍ତି) ପ୍ରାୟ ନାହିଁ ମହାଜାତି ।
 ଏହା(3) ଡାହାଣ (ମଝି (ମୋଦର) - ମହାକା,
 ଏହା ମଧ୍ୟ ଡାହାଣ - ପ୍ରାୟ ମହାକା,
 କାଳର ମାଳିକା ସିଦ୍ଧା ନାହିଁ ଡାହାଣ (ମହା ।
 ୧୪ କୁଳିକା, ୧୫ କୁଳିକା ହେଲା (କାହିଁ,
 ମହା ମହା ୩ କିଛି ହେଉଥିବା ବା ? -
 (ମଝି ମାଳିକା ମହା(3) କି କାଳର କୁଳିକା
 ମହାକା କାହିଁ ନାହିଁ (କାହିଁ ମହାକା ମାଳିକା !
 ଏହା (କାହିଁ) କାହିଁ ହେଲା - କାହିଁକି କହା -
 ମହାକା (କାହିଁ) କାହିଁ - ମହାକା ମହାକା ।
 ମହାକା ମାଳିକା ଏହି - ଏହି ମହାକା
 (ମହାକା ମାଳିକା (କାହିଁ) (କାହିଁ) ମାଳିକା)
 ମହାକା ମାଳିକା ଏହି (କାହିଁ) ମହା -
 ମହାକା ମାଳିକା କାହିଁ ମହାକା ମାଳିକା ।
 ଏ ମହାକା ମାଳିକା ୧୫ କୁଳିକା (କାହିଁ)
 ମହାକା ମାଳିକା ମହାକା - କାହିଁ । (କାହିଁ) ମହା
 (କାହିଁ) ମହା, ମହାକା ମାଳିକା ! (କାହିଁ) ମହା
 କାହିଁ, ମହାକା ମାଳିକା ମହାକା ମାଳିକା (କାହିଁ) ।
 ୩୪ ୩୫ ମହାକା, ମହାକା ମହାକା,
 ମହାକା ମହାକା ୧୫ - ମହାକା ।
 ଏହା, ମହାକା ମହାକା ମହାକା - ମହାକା
 ଏହା, ମହାକା ମହାକା ମହାକା - ମହାକା
 ମହାକା ଏହା ମହାକା ମହାକା -
 ଏହାକା (କାହିଁ) ମହାକା ମହାକା - ମହାକା ।

জিহ্না, (অসংসার উদ্দেশ্যে) মনঃ।
(মনঃ জিহ্না)

১০০

১ কৃত্তিবাসনামে, — মনঃ জিহ্না উদ্দেশ্যে।
মনঃ জিহ্না মনঃ-মনঃ জিহ্না মনঃ।
(কৃত্তিবাসনামে ৩ মনঃ)।

The next work which is begun in 1896 and completed in 1900 is a collection of the stories of Shakespeare's plays in narrative prose. The work has no higher merit than that it happens to be in its kind and otherwise the only complete version of Shakespeare not only in Bengali but in an Indian language. The author acknowledges his indebtedness to Lamb in many instances by which he perhaps means the twenty plays handled in Lamb's Tales. The other stories he works out independently.

Ananga-Rangini which is an adaptation of "As You Like It" does not rise above the level of the general run of such performances. Shakespeare is followed act by act, scene by scene and character by character, of course, Indianised : yet Shakespeare is not there - his thoughts and sentiments, his music and poetry and a hundred other graces are never attempted to be captured. Declamations after declamations are poured forth in place of Shakespeare's dramatic speeches, embodying the adapter's very commonplace thoughts and observations. The work is carried out in a mixture of prose and blank verse. Notice the following rendering of the famous passage "All the world's a stage etc.", (Act II) Sc. VII, where the adapter tries to improve upon Shakespeare with an importation of his own ordinary poetic fancies and Wordsworthian

sentiments - the result being anything but satisfactory :-

ସମ୍ପଦ ହୁଏ ଏ ଗ୍ରନ୍ଥ ମଧ୍ୟ !

ମତ !

ଚିନ୍ତନ ମୁନୀଳ ମୁଖ ଅସ୍ପଷ୍ଟ ଗତି

ଦ୍ରୁତ ଚିନ୍ତାଚିତ୍ତ କିମ୍ବଦନ୍ତ ଚିନ୍ତା !

ଆଉ ବିଳାସିତ କୃତ ଦୀପ ଅବଶ୍ୟ !

(କଥା ଅମଳାଳ ସାଗ- ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦେଶିତ !

ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦେଶ ଅବଶ୍ୟକ ହୁଏ ଶୁଦ୍ଧତା

କି ପାଦାଳ କୃତ ମୁଖ୍ୟ ମନା ମୁଖାଳିତ !

ସିନ୍ଧୁ ଏ-ସମ୍ପଦ ଗତି କଥା !

(ମ ସମ୍ପଦ ସାଗ ନେ କୃତ ଲିଖା କଥା !

(କଥା ଦେଖ ବାରି ସାରି' କଥା ଅବଶ୍ୟ !

ପାଦାଳ ମଧ୍ୟ କଥା କଥା କଥା (କଥା ?

କଥାଚିତ୍ତ କଥାଚିତ୍ତ ଏହା ମଧ୍ୟ !

ଅଥବା ଅବଶ୍ୟକ ଗ୍ରନ୍ଥ ଗ୍ରନ୍ଥ କି ?

କୃତ ମୁଖ ମୁଖାତ, ନବୀନ ନେତ୍ର !

ଅଥବା ଅଥବା ମୁଖ ମୁଖ ଗ୍ରନ୍ଥ କି କଥା ?

ଅଳକାତ (କେ ତାହାରେ ନୟ ନୃକମନ ?
 ଅକ୍ଷୟ (ସିଂହନ ଅକ୍ଷୟ ମୁନିତ ନୟନ ?
 ବୁଦ୍ଧିଶାଳୀ ସାଦୃଶ୍ୟ ତୁମି ଦିବ୍ୟ ଜ୍ଞାନ କାହିଁ
 ପୂଜାମୟ ଚିତ୍ରା କର, ବଳ (ଧାର୍ମିକ !
 ଅବିଚାର ମେ ଚିତ୍ତ ନ ଚିତ୍ତବିନ କର,
 ମାଧ୍ୟମ ଚିତ୍ତବି ତୁମି ବ୍ୟବହାର-ପଦ !
 ଏ ଦିବ୍ୟ ତୁମି-ତର ସାମାଜିକ-ମୟ
 ନିତି ନିତି ନବ-ସାଧନା-ପରକାର କର !
 ମୁନି-ମୁନି କର କାହିଁ ମଧ୍ୟମ-ସାଧନ,
 ମୁନି ବ୍ୟବ ବ୍ୟବ-କାଳିନ-କଳ୍ୟାଣ,
 ବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ ଚଳ ତୁମି ଅଳକା-ପଦ !
 ମାନବ ସାମାଜିକ ହିଲେ, କାଳ-ସାଧନ,
 ତାହାତେ ଓ ଅନୁଷ୍ଠାନୀ-ନରେ ତର ମୟ !
 ତର-ପର ପର ତୁମି (ଧାର୍ମିକ-ମାତ୍ର
 କିନ୍ତୁ ମଧ୍ୟମ ତର ଚିତ୍ତବି ବିନିୟମ
 ଅକ୍ଷୟ ମୁନି ହାସି, ନୟନ ~~କଳ୍ୟାଣ~~ କଳ୍ୟାଣ !
 ଅକ୍ଷୟ ମୁନି ମୁନି ତର-ତର-
 ବିନିୟମ ମାତ୍ର ତର ତାହାରେ ନାତ !
 ତର ପର କୁନ୍ଦ ମୁନି ମଧ୍ୟମ-ସାଧନ,
 ମଧ୍ୟମ-ସାଧନ ବ୍ୟବ ଚଳନେର ବିନିୟମ,
 ନୟନ (ନୟନ ଚଳ, ମଧ୍ୟମ-ସାଧନ
 ମଧ୍ୟମ-ସାଧନ-କଳ୍ୟାଣ କଳ୍ୟାଣ-ବିନିୟମ !

He tries to render Shakespeare from the middle of this passage but he is quite unequal to the task.

The next two productions which came out in the same year - Nalini-Vasanta an adaptation of "The Tempest" by Hemchandra and Macbeth a translation by the actor-playwright Girishchandra - are both great works. Hemchandra more than maintains his reputation of Romeo and Juliet and the observations which we made on the previous work as regards its graces of diction, language, music and poetry, its inimitable power of capturing and transcribing Shakespeare's thoughts and ideas, all worthy of the great master who is sought to be rendered, are applicable without any detraction in the case of the present work. It will be both convenient and illuminating to consider along with it another production called "Jhanjha" which purports to be a translation of the Tempest and was published in 1913. Hemchandra employs as usual the regular blank verse in his adaptation while the writer of Jhanjha imitates the free pattern of it affected by Girishchandra. This latter work which is an attempt at literal translation is, as will be seen, a very disappointing performance. The author is no poet. Girishchandra's genius is not his, and his verses are too wooden to have any music or graceful movement. They are nothing but prose cut up into lines and arranged in the form of poetic lines. But mere poetic arrangement of lines does not produce poetry. The divine fire and afflatus is not there with which the lines of both Hemchandra and Girishchandra are instinct. The writer of Jhanjha is also considerably handicapped by his attempt at too literal translation. In fact he does so much violence to the genius of his language in this insane attempt that in most places the lines yield no sense

and could only be grasped on a reference to the original lines in Shakespeare.

In order to give an adequate idea of Hemchandra's work, we cannot do better than give some parallel instances from these two versions of the "The Tempest".

Take for instances the lines 78-87 in Act III- Scene I.

FROM JHANJHA.

(ହରି ମଧ୍ୟ ଅପମନ୍ୟା,
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ନା ମାୟାରେ ଶାନ୍ତ ପାଶ
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ,
ନୂଆ କାଳେ ନା ବାମନେ ମଧ୍ୟେ,
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ପାଶେ ଅନନ୍ତରାଳ
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ।
ଏକ ଶାନ୍ତ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ, ଅନ୍ତରାଳ
ଏକ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ;
କିନ୍ତୁ ହେବା କିନ୍ତୁ ନା । ଶାନ୍ତ ପାଶ
ନାମରେ ଶାନ୍ତ,
ଏକ ଶାନ୍ତ କିନ୍ତୁ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ବିଷୟ
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ।
ଆମେ କିନ୍ତୁ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ କିନ୍ତୁ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ;
ନା କିନ୍ତୁ, ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଦାମି:
ଆମେ ନା ଅନ୍ତରାଳ କିନ୍ତୁ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ
ଆମେ;
କିନ୍ତୁ ଦାମି, ଏକ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ।

FROM NALINI-VASANTA.

କିନ୍ତୁ, ନାମ, ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ;
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ନାମ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ,
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ନାମ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ,
ନାମ ନାମ, ନାମ ନାମ, ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ।
ନାମ ନାମ ଏକ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ - ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଏକ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ!
(ଅନ୍ତରାଳ କିନ୍ତୁ କିନ୍ତୁ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ - ଅନ୍ତରାଳ
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ।
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ, ଅନ୍ତରାଳ, ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ,
ଏକ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ (ନାମ, ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ (ନାମ -
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ - ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ, ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ,
ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ 23 - ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ
ନାମ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ ଅନ୍ତରାଳ।

The difference between these two passages, it would be no exaggeration to say, is one of heaven and hell. The lines from the first work are no better, perhaps appreciably worse, than prose. It will be noticed that the author tries to give as many Bengali lines as there are lines in Shakespeare and thus, in attempting this condensed form of English expression, he makes himself unintelligible. Hemchandra, on the contrary, follows the genius of his language and in regular, musical blank verse exquisitely reproduces Shakespeare's sense.

Let us take another instance viz. the lines 148-158 in Act IV., Scene I.

FROM JHANJHA.

অভিনয় হমেছে সমাপ্ত । অভিনেতাগণ
যথাপূর্ব্ব কহিয়াছি, সকলই কামরত
মিশেছে পবনে, সুসম সমীরনে :
আর এই আধার বজ্রিত বন্ধুহীন দৃশ্যত,
অথভেদী দুঃখ সমৃদ্ধ প্রাগাদ,
সাম্রাট্য শাস্তিত দেবানয়, ক'ব কি অধিক,
নিখিল আবেগ সহ বিশাল ভুবন,
হইবে গমিত, ছায়া-মায়া না ব্যর্থ পশ্চাতে,
সেই ভূতে প্রজিত আয়রা স্বপনে যেমতি,
স্বপ্নমায়া আয়ুকান আকিষ্ট তনুয় ।

FROM HEMCHANDRA.

লীলা শুন সমাপন। এ বঙ্গ ভূমিতে
প্রেমোচ্ছিন্ন হত পীর কবি নব বেশ,
বাঘুর পুতলি অরা মিশিল বায়ুতে
মিশিয়া হইল লীন তরল আকাশে ।
হবে লীন এই রূপে, ইন্দ্ৰাদেবী মত,
মার্জার-পুতলি হত ঘানব এ-ভাবে ;
পাশানের অষ্টানিকা, অথভেদী দুঃখ,
দেউল, মন্দির, মাঠ উন্নত শরীর,
রাজনিকেতন কিম্বা দেব অষ্টানিকা
আভাষী, বহুঘণ্টা-দূর্ন হয়ে যাবে !
এই যে মহীয়শুন ফনীন্দ্র আপনে
পহোঁষি, পর্ব্বত, বৃক্ষ, প্রানী বৃন্দ সহ,
এও ধ্বংস হবে শেষে - চিরুচী না হবে !
অপার গুপ্তের ন্যায় নিদ্রাধ বেষ্টিত
অনিত্য আয়রা হবে অনিত্য জগতে ।

It is useless to quote more instances from the first named work. The only word that can be said in its favour is that the scenes of clowning are rather well rendered. As for instance Stephano's drinking song in Act II., Scene II., is well rendered in spirit and in its catchy turns. We close our reference to Hemchandra by giving another example of his translation of a memorable passage in the last Act, Sc.I., where Prospero frees the spirits of the air from their bondage and buries his magic staff "certain fathoms in the earth". Noble lines they are and fittingly are they rendered.

অহে ও পৰ্বতবাসী ^{পৰ্বত} ~~পৰ্বত~~ জন,
 ধুম ঘাড়া পৰ্বতের নিকরের ধারে,
 কাননে কনকরে কিম্বা নদ নদী তীরে—
 অহে ^{পৰ্বত} ~~পৰ্বত~~ জন, অমুদ্র বিনাসী,
 নদা বর্জ কর ঘাড়া অমুদ্র পুনিনে,
 তরঙ্গের পাছে পাছে ছুটে ছুটে যাও,
 জাটখা তরঙ্গ-থবে পাগরে নুকায়,
 আবার যখন ছুটে উঠে সে পুনিনে,
 তরঙ্গের আগে আগে ছুটিয়ে পান্নাও।—
 গগন-বিহারী ^{পৰ্বত} ~~পৰ্বত~~, নৃত্য কর ঘাড়া-
 ঘাটে ঘাটে জ্যোৎস্না বেতে, তুনে বেথা দিখে,
 প্রজাতে হারিনী যত আসে সে ঘাটেতে
 ম্লান পেয়ে সে তুনেতে মুগ্ধ না পরশে।
 তোমরা ও অহে যত, দশ দশ পবে
 বজ্রনীতে ভেদ কর প্রস্তুতিত।—

তোমাদের সকলের-পাশাঘোতে আমি,
 আমি যে দুর্জন জীব সামান্য মানব,-
 তুনেছি প্রলয় কড় দিবা দুপ্রহরে
 প্রচণ্ড ঘাওঁলু-বাশ্মি ধ্বংসকর করে :—
 নীলাম্বর, নীল-অম্বু আগরের-পনে
 বাধায়েছি ঘোর বন :- ইন্দ্রের বজ্রতে
 জ্বালায়েছি স্তম্ভশন :- দ্বিখণ্ড করেছি
 প্রকাশ শানের কাণ্ড সেই বজ্রাঘাতে :-
 অস্ত্রের করেছি বঁধা বাসুকীর শিরে ।
 উঠায়েছি প্রেত বৃন্দ প্রেত-রাজ্য হোতে
 মহাশক্তি ঘাদুঘ্নে করি আত্মবহ ।
 কিন্তু সে দুরন্ত বিদ্যা ত্রাজিনাম আজ,
 ত্রাজিনাম এই দণ্ডে-মুহূর্ত্ত মাত্রে
 আনিতে অমর রাজ্য জপিব ইহায়ে ;
 চেতনহীন পুনরীকৃত মনে নিয়ন্ত্রিত
 করিয়াছি যত জনে :- এখনি তা হবে—
 পবে-অস্ত-করি এই-যাকি সত-ভাগে
 গভীর-মোদিনী গর্ভে বাগ্মির-পুঁতিয়া ;
 কুহকের-প্রসূমানা-কারিব নিষ্কপ
 আগার আগর জনে । —

Girish Chandra's Macbeth is a memorable contribution in many ways. It is ^{not} merely a great translation but also the first Bengali version of Shakespeare to be put on the public stage in Bengal. In his Abhinetr-Kahini (Stories ^{of} great Bengali ^{actors} and actresses) pp. 38-39, Amarendra Nath Datta, ^a great Bengali actor and playwright, gives the following account of the occasion of this translation :- "Many educated Bengalees believed that the language and speeches of the witches in Macbeth were impossible of translation in Bengali. This excited the curiosity of Girish who began a translation to see if the impression was true. The result was such a conspicuous success that ever since Girish had been regarded as highly versed in English Literature by all English scholars". It is also well known that on the success on the stage of this translation depended his undertaking the translation of the rest of Shakespeare's plays. As already told, this success was denied to the play, for it failed to appeal to the gallery though it commanded great admiration of the educated part of the audience. It is also recorded in the same book that the production of Macbeth greatly contributed towards the improvement of the Bengali stage. English painters and stage decorators had to be employed to produce the setting of the play and the contact with them led to improved knowledge of stagecraft. Thus the money and labour expended on the venture was not wholly thrown away.

The translation is done in that kind of free blank-verse which is particularly associated with the name of the translator. It is not the regular type, the recognised vehicle

invented by Madhusudan and generally used in Bengali literature. This pattern was devised by Girish himself for stage purposes, and it must be admitted it lends itself admirably to declamation. It has also had a great vogue but it is strictly confined to dramatic composition. Girish Chandra uses prose also - not always in translating the prose passages of the original, but sometimes a poetical passage is rendered in prose. Shakespeare's thoughts and sentiments are reproduced with great mastery and faithfulness. Some songs are introduced by way of innovation and he is careful enough to mention that they are his additions. We know the reason for such additions - they are nothing but concessions to popular taste which demands songs and dances on the stage and Girish could not very well disregard it as the production was meant to be tried on the stage.

Let us now give some examples of his translation. We take first the scene of witchcraft in Act IV., Sc.I. It is very beautifully rendered - the language of translation breathes the same spirit of loathsomeness that is evoked by Shakespeare's description of the horrid rites.

১ম স্তম্ভিকা । তিনজন ১৬৫ মোন, ডাক দি(য)ল মিটে-মিটে গায়ে ,

২য়-স্ত । (যজ্ঞে ও মোর কানাক মোর তিনটে,
ডাক কল্লো মাঝে কিঁড়ে কিঁড়ে-কিঁড়ে ,

৩য়-স্ত । দু'জা দান ডাক মোন,
ময়ূর ২'ল্য ময়ূর ২'ল্য ।

১ম - স্ত । চন্দ্র চন্দ্র দুই দি(য), চন্দ্র দুই চন্দ্র কজা(য),
বিশি মায়ায় মাঁচি দুঁচি, কজা মায়া (দেও মায়া)।

રૂન રૂન બાથર ઠાંભા, રાજા રાના રાજી માર,
 રિજી રેજી રૂઝિયા દિન, દિન રાજી રૂઝિયા રૂઝિયા
 રિજીયા રાજી રૂઝિયા રાજી, રિજી રાજી રૂઝિયા રાજી,
 (દ ના (દ રૂઝિયા રૂઝિયા, (દ ના (રૂઝિયા રાજી રાજી.

ગણના। 246 માટૂની- 1320 1320,
 20 ફૂટ કડા 55 ફૂટ 2435।

25-51 | કનારા માળા 5 (51) નાના,

(ਸਭ ਕਾਏ ਸਿੰਘ ਨੇਨਾ,

ਅੰਤਰੀਕ (ਅੰਤਰ-ਨਿਰ)

(१०) श्री गुरुदेव अर्पणम् ।

$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}} \right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial x}$

ਕੀਤਾ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ,

(ਸਭਾ ਸਮੇਤ) ਫਿਰ ਸ਼ਾਮ ੫:੩੦,

દિ. ૬ ને જાના-માફિય જન,

। गिर । गिरि । गिरि । गिरि । गिरि ।

(ଦିନୀ ମିଆଁର ଶାନ୍ତ ଶାନ୍ତ)

19/11/2023 (Date)

(५७) (५८) २०१८ (५९) (६०)

(2) 25 2022 2022

2020/11/15
 2020/11/15

১৮-১৮। জাতি দ্বন্দ্বিতা দূরীকৃত

ਅਮਰਾਤ ਵੰਸ਼ ਵਿਸ਼ਿਸ਼ਤ (ਨ ਚਰ ਅਮਰ)

ਉੱਚੀ-ਛਾ- ਚਾਨੀ- ਮਾ,

(নানা মন্দির গ্রন্থে বর্ণিত)

উইচি-৬ নং হিঃ

ଅନ୍ତରାଳ - (୪ ଶ୍ରୁତି ୧୨୫),

वि.सं. १९९९ - २०००

ਮਾਂਗਣੀ ੧੭੮੫ ਖ਼ੂਨੀ ਮਾਯਾ,

(ଦରଦର ମାଲ ଦାଲ ମିଳେ,
 (ନ ଏ ସି-ସଦୀର ମାଲେ,
 ହାମଲର ମିତ୍ତି (ସାଗ,
 ମି(ମ (ମା କଡ଼ାମ (ରାଗ,
 କର ଚୁଁ(ଧର ଆଡ଼(ଧର ଗିଠା
 ମେ(ନର ଗଡ଼ କାଟା,
 ଚୁଁ(କୀର ନାକର ମିଠା,
 ଟାଣା(ର ମିଠି(ମାଲେ,
 ସି(ଧ(ଧ ଉ(ମ ସାମର ଦିଗ,
 ମୁ(ଧ ଗି(ମ ଉ(ମ (ଦାଲ ମା(ର,
 ମା(ମ (ମେ ଧୁ(ଧ(ଧ(ଧ,
 ଏ(ମ (ଦ(ମା କଡ଼ାମ (ଧାମ,
 ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ,
 କ(ଧ ମା(ମ କ(ଧା (ଧା(ଧ,
 କା(ଧ ଚୁଁ(ଧି ଉ(ଧ ଡେ(ଧ,
 ସ(ଧ(ଧା ଧ(ଧ କ(ଧା(ଧ(ଧ।

ମ(ଧ(ଧ। ସା(ଧ, ସା(ଧ ନି ଧି(ଧ ଧି(ଧ,
 ଧ(ଧ(ଧ କ(ଧା ଧ(ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ(ଧ।

୧୫-୬। ଧ(ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ(ଧ ମା(ଧ(ଧ
 ଧ(ଧ(ଧ କ(ଧା ମ(ଧ(ଧ(ଧ,
 ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ
 ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ(ଧ ଧ(ଧ।

ଧ ଧ ଧ.

Notice how beautiful and faithful is the translation of
such a passage as this "She should have died hereafter etc." -
Act V., Sc.V, ll. 17-28.

ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ।

— ଓହ୍ଲାଇବେ —

। ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ (୨୮)

— ଯଦିଓ — ଯଦିଓ — ଯଦିଓ —

ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

— ଯଦିଓ — ଯଦିଓ — ଯଦିଓ —

— ଯଦିଓ — ଯଦିଓ — ଯଦିଓ —

। ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

। ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

— ଯଦିଓ — ଯଦିଓ — ଯଦିଓ —

। ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ ଅଥା ଯଦିଓ ମୃତ୍ୟୁଃ କାଳଃ

Instances can be multiplied but they are hardly necessary. The greatness of the production is admitted on all hands and it unquestionably forms one of the landmarks in Bengali versions of Shakespeare.

Jahanara which follows next is a prose adaptation of "A Midsummer Night's Dream" and is of a very poor kind. It may be regarded as a new but crude play on the Shakesperian theme. It is called by the author a musical comedy and is, as such, full of songs. A song in the nature of a prologue opens it and another in the nature of an epilogue ends it - both ~~xxx~~ the songs being sung by fairies with dances. Bottom has a counterpart in a rustic who has heard of fairies and is longing to marry one and becomes the object of the fairy queen's insane infatuation in the transfigured shape of an ass, but Bottom's peerless company of players is not there. Puck's counterpart Miria is made to fall in love with one of the female attendants of the fairy queen - a Nemesis which his pranks rightly deserve but which Shakespeare forgot to award him ! Shakesperian love intrigues are there but they are very ~~xxxxxxx~~ clumsily managed. Altogether, the play has no right to claim any near kinship with Shakespeare. It was, however, acted on the Bengali stage and masqueraded for a time as Shakespeare.

The translation of King Lear by Jatindra Mohan Ghosh can hardly be regarded as an important contribution to Bengali literature. It must however be classed much above Jhanja, being a very painstaking attempt at somewhat literal translation of Shakespeare in the free blank verse of Girish Chandra's pattern. The verse employed however has neither the music nor the ~~express-~~

elements etc., " in Act III., Sc.I, R. 4-15).

ଅନ୍ୟାନ୍ୟ ଏହା ଦୃଷ୍ଟି-ପଟରୁ ଆସି ସୃଷ୍ଟି କରାଯାଇ । ତାହା ଏହା ନବନାଟ,
ସଦା ଯାହା ମଧୁସୂଦାନ ଡାକିଲେ (କଳାତ, ଯାହା ଜଣାଶୁଣା ଯାହା ଏହି ଅନ୍ତର୍ଦ୍ଧେୟ ହୁଏ
ନିଜେ ଆମେ କରାଯାଇ । ତାହା ଦେଖିବା (ଏ, ଏହା ଏହା ଡାକିଲେ ହେଉ ମଧୁସୂଦ-ଏକାକୀ
ସଦା କରୁ, ଏହା ଜଣାଶୁଣା ମଧୁସୂଦ ହେଉ ଏକାକୀ ପାରିବତ୍ୟ ସହ । ଉପାଦାନାମ
ନିଜେ ତିଆରି କରାଯାଇ; କଳାତାଳିକା ଏହାକାର ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦେଶ (ଏହାକାର ମାତ୍ର ଡାକିଲେ;
(ଏହା ମେ ତାଳି ଯାଉଛି । କଳାତର ପାରିବତ୍ୟ ସଦା-ସଦା ମାନବ ଶକ୍ତିର କରୁ ହୁଏ
ହୁଏତାଳି କରାଯାଇ । ଏହାକାର ମଧ୍ୟମ-ଆମେ-ହୁଏ ଏହାକାର ନିଜ ମାତ୍ର ଯାହା
କରାଯାଇ ଯାହା । ମଧ୍ୟମ ହୁଏତାଳି-ଦିଶି-ଏହାକାର ମାତ୍ର ମଧ୍ୟମ ହୁଏତାଳି
ହୁଏତାଳି । ତାହା ମଧ୍ୟମ-ଆମେ କରାଯାଇ ମଧ୍ୟମ ହୁଏତାଳି କରାଯାଇ ଯାହା
କରାଯାଇ ଏହାକାର ହୁଏତାଳି ହୁଏତାଳି ।

Take the following poetical rendering from the next scene.

Lear's speech "Blow, winds and crack your cheeks ! &c." (II.11-9
and 14-24).

ହେ ପ୍ରବଳ, ହେ ମଧ୍ୟମ

ଏହାକାର ହେ; ହେ ଆମେ (ଆମେ)

ଜଣାଶୁଣା ହୁଏତାଳି ଆମେ । ମଧ୍ୟମ ହେ ଆମେ ହୁଏତାଳି;
(ଆମେ-ଆମେ ହେ ଆମେ ନିଜାତ ହେ ମଧ୍ୟମ ହୁଏତାଳି;
ମଧ୍ୟମ ! ଏହାକାର ଏହାକାର

ହେତାଳି (ଏହାକାର ହୁଏତାଳି ଆମେ ହୁଏତାଳି)

ହେତାଳି ଆମେ ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି

ହେତାଳି (ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି)

(ଆମେ ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି)

ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି

ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି ହେତାଳି

ମହାଶୟ ନିଜେ ଦୂର ଶ୍ରୋତା !
 ମୁହଁ ମୁହଁ ବଜ୍ର ଅମାଣ ! ଶାସ୍ତ୍ରୀଙ୍କ ଶବ୍ଦ ଶାସ୍ତ୍ରୀଙ୍କ !
 (ହେ ଅମାଣ, ବଜ୍ର, ଶାସ୍ତ୍ରୀ, ଶାସ୍ତ୍ରୀ ଅମାଣ ମାଣ,
 ତନୁ ମାୟା ନୁହେଁ ଗୋପନୀ ମହାଣ,
 ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣ ପ୍ରଭାବେ ! ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣ କୃଷ୍ଣ ଶାସ୍ତ୍ରୀଙ୍କ ଶାସ୍ତ୍ରୀଙ୍କ ?
 ଦିଅନ୍ତୁ କି ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀ ? ମହାଶୟ କହୁ ମହାଶୟ ?
 ତାହା କେବଳ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ?
 ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ।
 ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ (ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ
 ନିଃସ୍ଵ, ଦୁଃଖୀ, ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ, ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ।
 ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ, — ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ,
 (ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ
 ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ? (ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀକୃଷ୍ଣଙ୍କ ।

It is a powerful scene, the tempest raging in Lear's heart finding a fit expression in this ferocious and awesome challenge to the destructive elements let loose in Nature's storm. It will be seen that the passage is not unworthily rendered above. The wild beats of Lear's storm-tossed soul are very well caught and the language, though it falls short of that perfection which a true poet might have given it, is never below what would be termed adequate. It will be also noticed that the author avoids too much literalness in translation and that saves him from the pit falls in which the author of Jhanjha has completely wrecked himself.

Manilal's Rudra Sena (Othello) is another very successful adaptation in Bengali and it ranks not much below the works of Hemchandra. It also follows the lines laid down by Hemchandra for Shakesperian versions in Bengali. As has already been pointed out, such adaptations are not far removed from translations, and if successful, must be treated with as much respect as a successful translation. The author employs the regular blank verse and he possesses a gift for it. The only demerit that is found in the work is that sometimes the author unnecessarily abbreviates a passage - takes merely the sense of it and puts it down in his own language in his own way. Free translation does not exclude literalness where such literalness is possible and within the power of the language of translation. He seems to be too nervous in this respect and avoids literal translation even where it will suit the genius of his medium and preserve both the sense and the beauty of Shakespeare.

On the whole, however, it is a highly creditable production. For instance, notice how beautifully he renders the Scene (Act III, Sc. III, ll. 90-to the end), in which Iago with the cleverness of a consummate rogue sows the seeds of suspicion in guileless Othello's heart and gradually works him up into desentendness. Othello is irretrievably caught in the toils of diabolical Iago and is committed to a course from which there is no returning. The translation reads as powerful as the original and we only wish we had the space to reproduce it fully - for partial reproduction will defeat its own purpose.

We give below an instance of his translation from another passage and it is hoped that its beauty will be at once acknowledged.

The following is his rendering of Othello's account of his wooing and winning the heart of Desdemona :- Act I, Sc. III, H.
128-170.

ମିତ୍ର ଶାନ୍ତିକାର କାହିଁନି (ସୁର ଯୋଗ);
ନିମନ୍ତ୍ରଣ କରି' ଗରେ ଆମର ଆମର,
କାହିଁନି ଅନୁରୋଧ-ଗର୍ବିତ ଆମର
ଜୀବନେ ଶେଷିଆମ - ପୁରୁଷାବର ମର ।
ସୁଦ୍ଧ, ଅବହେଳ, ଅନୁରୋଧ-କାହିଁନି ମର
ଶାନ୍ତିକାର ଆମର ମର (ମିତ୍ର ଅବହେଳ) ।
କାହିଁନି ଶେଷିଆମ କହ ବିଜୟ କାହିଁନି-
ଗିରି-ପଟେନା କହ ଆମର ମରମର;
ଜୀବନ ମରର ଦୂର ଶାନ୍ତି କେବଳେ,
(କେବଳେ ଦୁର୍ଦ୍ଦାତ ଆମର କାହିଁନି ଦାମକାର
ବିଜୟ କାହିଁନି ଯୋଗ; ଆମର ଅବହେଳ
(କେବଳେ ଆମର ମରବିଜୟ କେବଳେ,
ମଜିର ମରର, କଳାହୀନ ମରମର,
ଅବହେଳ ମରବିଜୟ, ଅବହେଳ, ମରର,
(ଦାମିନୀୟ ମରର ବିଜୟ କେବଳେ,
କାହିଁନି ଏକ ଏକ ଆମର ଶାନ୍ତି ମର;-
ନରମା; ମ (କାହିଁନି କହ ଶାନ୍ତିକାର କେବଳେ
ଅବହେଳ କେବଳେ ନର (ଦାମିନୀୟ କେବଳେ-
ମରର ଶାନ୍ତି ଆମର ମରର ବିଜୟ)
ଅବହେଳ ଆମର କେବଳେ ଶାନ୍ତି ଏକ
ମର କାହିଁନି ଅବହେଳ କାହିଁନି ଶାନ୍ତି
ଅବହେଳ ମରର କେବଳେ ଆମର ।
ଏକକିନ ଏକକିନି-ଶାନ୍ତି-ବିଜୟ
କାହିଁନି ଆମର ଶାନ୍ତି-ଅବହେଳ
"ଜୀବନେ ଶେଷିଆମ ପୁରୁଷାବର ମର,-

ଏହା ମଧ୍ୟ-ଓଡ଼ିଆ ଖୁବ୍ ଡାକିଲାଣି ଆମ୍ଭ—

ଓଡ଼ିଆରେ ଖୋଜିଲେ ୨/୫/୬୯ ଆସନ୍ତେ ।”

ମୟର ୨୫ରୁ ଆମ୍ଭ । ଶବ୍ଦର ଧାର

(କିମ୍ଭାବେ ଧାରଣା ଆମ୍ଭେ ମାରିଲାଣି ଧର,

ଓଡ଼ିଆର ଧାରଣା ଓଡ଼ିଆ ନାମାଲି ;

ଓଡ଼ିଆ ଶବ୍ଦର ଧାରଣା ବିଷୟ ନିଷ୍ପତ୍ତି

“ ମାରି ତି ମାରି-ଓଡ଼ିଆ ଶବ୍ଦର ଧାରଣା !

ଓଡ଼ିଆ ଶବ୍ଦର ଧାରଣା ! ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ?

ଧାରଣା ! ଧାରଣା ଶବ୍ଦର ଧାରଣା ?

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା, “ଧାରଣା ! ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ।

ଧାରଣା ! ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା,

(ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା, ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ।”

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା,

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ।

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା- ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା, ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ।

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା- (ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ।

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା, ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା-

ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା, ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା ଧାରଣା । —

Among Bengali translations of Shakespeare Julius Caesar by Jyotindra Nath Tagore easily ranks first. A free but faithful translation, it is carried out in regular blank verse in highly chaste and elegant Bengali. The author is an elder brother of Sir Rabindra Nath Tagore and is one of the luminaries of Bengali literature only overshadowed like others by the greatest and brightest star of them all, the great poet. Jyotindra Nath is a versatile writer in both prose and poetry and as a translator of foreign and Sanskrit works - specially Sanskrit dramas - into Bengali, he is perhaps the greatest among dead and living Bengali authors. It is only to be expected that a translation of Shakespeare from a gifted writer like him who is also a ripe scholar of English and French literatures will be a worthy reproduction in every respect and no room is left for disappointment in the executed work.

In certain speeches some passages are deliberately omitted by the translator and we can do nothing but praise the wisdom of the author which dictates such omissions. Invariably the omitted passage is highly allusive of classical lore and is calculated to prove a stumbling block to a reader not acquainted with English. As for instance, in Act I, Sc. II, from Cassius's speech - "I know that virtue to be in you &c. II. 90 following", the following lines are omitted :-

"I, as Aeneas, our great ancestor,
Did from the flames of Troy upon his shoulder
The old Anchises bear, so from the waves
of Tiber etc.,"

The retention of a passage like this would have required a footnote of explanation - a very annoying and irritating way to call off attention and spoil the pleasure of reading, while the omission does not lessen the beauty of the passage in any the least degree. However, these omissions notwithstanding, the work is a model of translation. Notice the following instances of his translation of Portia's two speeches in Act, II, Sc. I, ll. 279-287 and 291-302 :-

ଆର୍ଡ଼ି- କି ଜାତିଆ ନାଏ, ଏହା (ଧୂଳି)
 ନହ (ମଝେ- (ମୋହ) ଆଉ ମୁଣ୍ଡର କୁଣ୍ଡଳାୟା;
 କାନ୍ଧେ (ଏ ମଞ୍ଜିକା) ବିକାରେ କାଳ
 ଓର ଗଳେ ନାଏ ଆମି ଏହା ମର ଆଦିକାର
 — ଚୁର୍ଚ୍ଚୁ ତେ ଓଡ଼ୁ କଥା- ନା ନାଏ କାମନା?
 ଯୋଗ (ଏ ଏକାକୀ) (ମଝେ - (ମା କି ତେ ଆଦିକି?)
 ତେ ମାମି- ଏକ ଆଦେ କାରି (ଓମନ,
 ମୁହ- ଆଦା ବିହାର, ମାଳା ମାଳା କର କଥା,
 — ଏହି କି ଗା ଏକାକୀ- ଯୋର ଆଦିକାର?
 ଏବ କି ଚୁକିର ଆମି- ତେ ମୁହ ନମସ୍କାର
 ତେ କାନ୍ଧେ- ଚୁର୍ଚ୍ଚୁ- ଆମି କାରି ତେ କାମ?
 ଯୋର ଆଦିକାର ଯା ନାହି ୨୪, ୨୫ ୨୬
 (ନାମିଆ- ଗାନ୍ଧିଆ — ନହେ ମଞ୍ଜି- କୁଣ୍ଡଳାୟା)

(The King shows soft-heartedness and indifference in the act of government and the royal mother is advised to effect the marriage of her son which alone can make a man complete).

The Royal Priest holds forth as follows :-

অনুভব যুবক রাজা ! এনোচিত দয়া
 মায়া, যত বেশী শ্বেহ অরনতা তাই ।

 পুরুষ অধিক প্রকৃতি আধিক তার,
 উভয়ে মিলিলে হয় পূৰ্ণতা মাধন ।
 এই পূৰ্ণতাৰ সম্পাদন, সংস্কারে
 প্রথম গোপান ! হৃদয়ের পারিণতি,
 জ্ঞানের বিকাশ, কৰ্ত্তব্যের প্রগাঢ়তা,
 বিধান পালন, শিক্ষা হয় শ্রী-পুরুষে
 মিলন হইলো -----

Tejasimha (Angelo) is a conscious and deliberate scoundrel in this play, which Angelo is not in the original. Every piece of his villainy is preconceived and predesigned, which is proved by the following soliloquy (Act III, Sc.1, Pages 38-39 of the adaptation).

কিন
 কে বলে কুটিল নীতি মন্থ সংগোপন
 বিপথ্য সংসারে ; অরনতা ন্যায় নিষ্ঠা
 উন্নতির মূল ? মুখের কল্পনা উহা,
 অক্ষয় যে জন, শুধু সংপথে চলা
 তাহারি সম্ভব যাহ । আত্মবলো বনী-
 যের, প্রতিভা যাহার বস্তুমুখী, এই
 কাপুরুষ যোগ্য সাথে চলিলে সে জন,
 নিশ্চয়-মিষ্টিয়া-যাহ, উদ্দেশ্য বিহীন-
 বুদ্ধ-বুদ্ধের মত সংসার-জলাধি-মাকে ।

The work is not Shakespeare and as an independent play it is of very doubtful merit.

"Tamalini" is another great work. It is an adaptation but is as good as a translation. The characters are Indian characters but very little change in any other respect, except when such change is imperatively demanded by the Indian setting and atmosphere, is introduced. All the acts and scenes are kept intact and prose and verse employed in the order in which they appear in the original. The translation of the passages is free and faithful in the most elegant and poetical blank verse of the regular type. Shakespeare's thoughts and sentiments are very faithfully and gracefully reproduced so that they suffer little sea-change. Prose passages are also rendered inimitably. The author is little known in Bengali literature but this one work will secure him a permanent place in the future history of his country's literature. As far as adaptations go, the honour are equally divided between Hem Chandra and this author. It is a pity that we have to exercise restraint in quoting illustrative passages from this work. Below are a few instances :-

অক্ষ । এবে-পথে ! বড় পার্ব-পাজাহ্ তোমায়
 তব যোগ্য আত্মনা-বসন্ত-কুসুম ।
 কিন্তু হায় ! কোথা তব পাব-এগময়,
 ওহো, কোথা পাব সেই পারিজাত মানা-
 নন্দনে মন্দার তলে তুমি দেব-বানী !
 চমকিতা দৈত্যপুত্র দিনা-খাতা হেরি ।

কোথা পে কুমুদন দেখি হবে থাওয়া
না আসিত পিককুন দেখা দেয় আসি
কুঞ্জবনে, হেলি দুনি এসত পয়ীরে-
দুয়া মুখা রানি নীরব কাননে ।
কোথা অপবাজিতা স্তিমিত নোচনা,
হুন্দীর-জিনি কপো হুন্দীর-নয়ন,
শেফালিকা কুশাখিনী পড়ে ছেই তলি
আনুত, অকল বঁধু না চুম্বিতে তানে
শোথগে, তরুণী দলে নহে যা বিবল !
কোথা পে তমান কুন, কমলের দল
নানা জাতি, মনপায়ে গাঁথি^{যা} ~~কি~~ মানা
পরায়ণ তব গলে, ফুলতনু তব-
দিব করি আচ্ছাদন কুমুদ ভূষনে ।

নীহার । শব দেহ আচ্ছাদন করে-যেই মত ?

অশ্র । নহে শব-প্রায় মত্রে ! ফুলশ্রাব্যত
প্রোমিকের প্রেমলীনা বিশ্বাসের তরে ।

তব তরে-প্রান বঁধু নহে চিতানন,
উদ্দীপিত প্রেমানন ময় আনিখন ।

Take next the lines 135-146 :-

যাহা কিছু কর তুমি কর প্রিয়তমে !
পূৰ্বকৃত হোতে যেন অধিক মন্দর !
যবে কথা-কহু মাথি ! মাথি হয় মনে
কেবল কথাই মদা কহ বিধুমুখি !
যবে তুমি কর গান, হুচ্চা হয় যেন
কর গান দিবানিশি, গানে বেচাকেনা-
গানে উপাসনা, দান, ভজন, অর্চনা
গৃহকার্য উপদেশ অমরুই গানে ।
যবে নৃত্য কর প্রিয়ে মাথি হয় মনে

পাগর তরফে হয়ে বহু কিছু মাঝে,
 হেনে দুনে দিযানিশি নৃত্য কব যেন,
 নৃত্য বিনা আর কিছু না হয় করিতে।
 তোমার প্রত্যেক কার্য-প্রত্যেক বিষয়ে
 এমন মার্মার্থ্য হয়,† এমন সুন্দর,
 আশ্রিত তুলনা তার দেখিলা জগতে।

Soodagar is a prose adaptation of The Merchant of Venice and is a very crude and disappointing production. Various departures are made from Shakespeare's story. The following are some instances. The characters of Gratiano, Salarino and Salanio are altogether omitted. Lorenzo who is Niranjan in the adaptation plays the part of Gratiano in the trial scene and elsewhere. Jessica (Juthica) accompanies Portia (Prativa) to the court and not Nerissa (Niraja). Jessica (Juthica) marries Lorenzo (Niranjan) with the consent of her mother who is alive before her elopement, her father being kept ignorant of the match. Nerissa (Niraja) has a male counterpart Ahlade by name, a male servant to Portia (Prativa). The two are secretly fond of each other, but outwardly Niraja is cold and repulses the advances made by Ahlade who, by the way, happens to be a son of Launcelot Gobbo (Natabara). A humorous situation is thus created and a good deal of wit is expended on a stratagem by which Ahlade succeeds in extorting a confession of love from Niraja's mouth. The ring incident is wholly omitted and the identity of the young lawyer and his clerk

is otherwise revealed. Some of the original speeches in their substance are reproduced in the adaptation.

The play is full of light, frivolous songs and dances which hardly suit the grim and sombre character of the story. Humour of a coarse and cheap kind is liberally introduced to degrade it further. Shylock (Kuliraka) is painted here as a human monster without those, though very rare, fine touches which relieve his cruelty. The national antipathies on which the superstructure of his gigantic hatred of Antonio is built by Shakespeare is absent here as in all adaptations of this play and thus the character of Shylock is further dehumanised. He is a mere money-lender who practises usury with repugnant hard-heartedness, a hard taskmaster and slave-driver in respect of his servant Launcelot, a cruel father and husband, in short an impossible monster. It is difficult to see how this play could pass itself off as Shakespeare on the stage where it enjoyed a run for a time.

This special survey of the Bengali versions of Shakespeare closes with the notice of two productions which came out only last year. They are two prose translations - one of Hamlet and the other of The Merchant of Venice - by Monmohan Ray, and actor-dramatist of considerable distinction in Bengal. It should be pointed out here that we have been able to procure only a copy of Hamlet and our remarks will necessarily be confined to this work. The work is carried out in a somewhat novel form. The aim of the writer seems to be to tell the story but he does not entirely keep to the narrative form. The book is divided into chapters and not acts and scenes. There are 16 chapters which almost follow the number of scenes in the original which is 20 in the five acts.

Every chapter begins with an introductory statement in narrative prose and then the story is carried on in dialogues which are often adequately reproduced from Shakespeare. There are short narrative passages occurring in the midst of a chapter or at the end, and these, together with the introductions, form so many links of the story. Verse is used very sparingly—blank verse being used in the passage recited by the players before Hamlet and in the play which is produced before his uncle and mother. Some of the songs—indeed the ones excepted in the scene of Ophelia's madness are rendered poetically.

Hornohan Ray is a gifted writer both of prose and verse. The work is worthy of him within the limitations which he has, for reasons inexplicable to us, imposed upon himself. We only wish he had attempted a real translation of Shakespeare in blank verse. We have a right to expect great things of him and he would not have disappointed us. As it is, the prose of his translation is chaste, noble and dignified and his understanding of the text is adequate. His blank verse maintains in every way the reputation of his prose. It is a thousand pities that with all this equipment he should circumscribe himself in the way he has done in the work under notice. We give below some extracts from his prose translation.

Act III, Sc. I, II. 55-90 "To be or not to be" ; that is question" etc.

কি কৰি ? কোন পথে যাব ?—বাঁচি কিম্বা মৰি ?—অমৰ্য্যাত্মন ! উদ্ভাৱনী
নিয়তিৰ হস্ত স্থিতি অহস্ত শৈল্য, বীৰেৰ ন্যায় বুক পেতে নওয়াহ—মুখ্যত্ব ?—না,
বিষ্ণুক পিঙ্গুৰ প্লাবন গতি প্রতিরুদ্ধ কৰিতে গিয়ে, আন্তৰ্জ্বৰ লোপ কৰাহঁ উচিত ?
মৃত্যু আৰু মুক্তি, একই কথা । কোনও পার্থক্য নাই । তাইলৈ মুখাতিৰ-

কোন স্থানে, জীবনের সম্মুখেই শোক তাপ ঘন, সব ভুলিয়ে থাওয়া কি মানুষের
 আকাঙ্ক্ষিত পরিণতি নয়? কিন্তু তাতে এক ভয়! স্বপ্ন-নিদ্রা! নিদ্রা-স্বপ্ন! কে
 জানে কোন অজানা স্বপ্নে, এই মুখের মুখমোহে ভেঙে দিবে? জানেনা মানব
 সে স্বপ্ন, সুখময় কি দুঃখময়। তাই তার বৃত্তি চিত্ত। তাই তার এত ভাবনা।
 তাই নাহলে, কি মানব, যুদ্ধ ভাবে, দুঃখ দুঃখের সোকা বয়ে বেড়াতে পারতো?
 তা নাহলে কি নির্বাক স্নেহ হয়ে, মানুষ নিঃশব্দ কষ্টদাতা, পীড়কের অগ্নিচোর,
 গর্জনের শব্দটি, প্রণয়ের প্রত্যাশান, ন্যায়ের দীর্ঘ শৃঙ্খল, নীচের পদদাতা,
 মাথা পেতে নিতে পারতো? যখন তার ক্ষুদ্র দুর্বিকার, অতি সামান্য আশঙ্ক
 এক নিমিষে পে, এই জটিল জীবন-সমস্যার সীমাহীমা-কবে দিতে পারে, কেন-
 তা হলে সে হুঁচকাবে, এই সুকতার জীবনের বোঝা যে বয়ে বেড়ায়? সে
 জানে যে মহমার নির্যাস, কুটিল, কঠোর দুঃখময়, দৈন্যময় হলে ও নিশ্চিত।
 তাই নিশ্চিত হোতে অনিশ্চিত যেতে তার প্রাণ কঁপে উঠে। তা সে অস্বাভাবিক
 বদলে সব সহ্য করে যায়। এই অতর্কিত আঘাতের ভীকতার কারণ। হীহাই-
 আঘাতের অতর্কিতের সাথে ভীষণ অনুরাগ। দুঃখ! ওই ওয়েলিফা আসছে। সুন্দরী
 সুন্দরী! দেবতার কাছে মাঝে মাঝে আঘাত কখন কখন, মানবকারিও।

. It will be seen that the passage is well rendered up to line 76 and then he slurs over the very beautiful lines "Who would fardels bear etc. And thus the native hue of resolution is sicklied / o'er with the pale cast of thought" to line 88. This is unpardonable considering that the translator is quite equal to the task. It seems to us that the writer has aimed at producing a book for school use and his success in that respect is assured.

The best part of this work is the author's magnificent tribute to the memory of the ~~wax~~ world's greatest dramatist, which he inscribes to the production in six lines of exquisite poetry.
 We can fittingly close our work by quoting these lines of homage which very faithfully echo that sentiment of love and reverence that ever beats in the heart of all Indian born Shakesperian scholars.

Rest in peace in thy grave, O mighty bard !

Immortal shalt thou remain through ages and ages ;

As long as the dramatic art will last on earth

Thy genius will shine in full splendour.

Sleep on, thou golden swan of Avon,

Let the wide world be filled with thy melody.

[অমায়িক-শয়ন-নিদ্রা-যাও করিব-ব !
 যুগ-যুগান্তর-তুমি বহিবে অমর-।
 নাট্য-কলা যত-দিন বহিবে ধ্বংস-
 তুমিবে প্রতিভা-সম্পন্ন-পূর্ণ গাবিমাণ ।
 নিদ্রা-যাও, আশ্রম-সুখ-মরান !
 ছন্দে তব-পূর্ণ হৈক বিশ্ব-পুৰিমান ।]

Appendix I.

A bibliography of Shakespearean adaptations and translations
in India.

1. BENGALI ADAPTATIONS.

- Romeo-oJulieter Manohar Upakhyan (prose story) 1848.
Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare by Muktaream Vidyavagish and
friends 1852.
Bhanumati-Chittavilasa by Harachandra Ghosh (The Merchant of
Venice) 1853.
Charumukha Chittahara by Harachandra Ghosh (Romeo and
Juliet) 1864.
Susila-Virasinha. Anonymous (Cymbeline) 1868.
Bhrantivilasa by Pandit Isvarchandra Vidyasagar (prose story)-
(The Comedy of Errors).
Susila-Chandraketu by Kantichandra Vidyaratna (prose story-
(The Twelfth Night) 1872.
Bhramajala Nataka by Venimadhav Ghosh (The Comedy of Errors)
1873.
Amarasinha by Prematha Natha Vasu (Hamlet) 1874.
Rudra Pala Nataka by Haralal Ray (Macbeth).
Bhimasinha by Tarinicharan Pal (Othello) 1875.
Madannanjari. Anonymous. (The Winter's Tale). 1876.
Brutas-o-Antonir Vaktvta (a poem).
Suralata Nataka by Pyarilal Mukhopadhyaya (The Merchant of
Venice) 1877.
Ajaya Sinha-Vilasavati by Yogendra Narayan Das Ghosh (Romeo
and Juliet) 1878.
Chandranath by Siddhesvara Gupta (Hamlet) 1894.
Othello by Kali Prasanna Chattopadhyaya 1894.
Romeo-Juliet by Hemchandra Bandopadhyaya 1895.
The Plays of Shakespeare by Harachandra Raksita (prose
stories) 1896-1900
Ananga-Rangini by Annada Prasad Vasu (As you like it) 1897.
Nalini-Vasanta by Hemchandra Bandopadhyaya (The Tempest) 1900.
Jahanara by Satishchandra Chattopadhyaya (A Midsummer Night's
Dream) 1904.
Rudrasena by Nanilal Bandopadhyaya (Othello) 1906.
Vinimaya by Birendra Nath Ray (Measure for Measure) 1909.
Tagalini by Dhanadacharan Mitra (The Winter's Tale) 1914.
Saodagar by Bhupendra Nath Bandopadhyaya (The Merchant of
Venice) 1915.

BENGALI TRANSLATIONS.

- Macbeth by Taraknath Mukhopadhyay, 1875.
Hamlet by Chandi Prasad Ghosh, 1894.
Macbeth by Girish Chandra Ghosh, 1900.
King Lear by Yatindra Mohan Ghosh, 1902.
Julius Caesar by Jyotindra Nath Thakura, 1907.
Jhanjha (The Tempest) by Nagendra Prasad Sarvadhicary, 1913.
The Merchant of Venice by Mon Mohan Ray.
Hamlet by Mon Mohan Ray.

GUJRATI ADAPTATIONS.

1. All's Well that Ends Well by Narayana Hemchandra. Vaidya-Kanya - Ahmadabad, 1895.
2. Cymbeline - By Gopalji Kalyanaji Delvadakar. Ramanasundari - Bombay, 1895.
3. The Merchant of Venice - By Narsilal Vansamaldas. Strinyakala^{nya} - Bombay, 1893.

GUJRATI TRANSLATIONS.

1. The Comedy of Errors - By Nanabhai Rustamji Ranina-Jodiyabhaio - Bombay, 1865.
2. Measure for Measure - By Harbhesankara Pranajivana Dave - Bhaunagar, 1906.
3. Othello by Nanabhai Rustamji Ranina - Kasrivajnan Karasthan - Bombay, 1868.
4. Romeo & Juliet - By Dosabhai Framji Randeria - Bombay, 1876.

HINDI ADAPTATIONS.

1. The Comedy of Errors - By Ratnachanda. Bhramajalaka Nataka, Allahabad, 1879.
2. The Merchant of Venice - By Krishna Hasrat. Ek Aurat Ki Wakalat, Benaras, 1908.
3. Othello by Gadadhar Sinha - prose version of the story.

HINDI TRANSLATIONS.

1. As you Like it - By Gopinath of Jaipur, Manabharana, 1897.
2. King Lear - By Badari Narayan, Snehaparikā, 1903.
3. The Merchant of Venice by Arya - Venis Nagar Ka Byapari, Benaras, 1886.
4. Romeo and Juliet by Gopinath of Jaipur. Premalila, 1898.

HINDUSTANI ADAPTATIONS.

1. As you Like it - By Charan Das, Dilpazir, 1901.
2. The Comedy of Errors, By Abdal-Karim, Bhul-bhulaiyan, 1913.
3. The Comedy of Errors - By Narayana-Prasada - Gorakh-dhanda, 1913.
4. Cymbeline - By Muhammad 'Abdal-Aziz, 1902.
5. Hamlet - By Mahdi Hasan Khan, Khur i' nahagga, 1901.
6. Hamlet by Muhammad Afzal Khan, 1902.
7. Hamlet by Nazer Beg - Wahi'ah i Jahangir i nachad, 1904.
8. King Lear by Muhammad Shah, Sufed-Khun, 1911.
9. King Richard III - By Agha Muhammad - Said i hawas, 1909.
10. A Midsummer Night's Dream by Muhammad Azhar 'Ali-Jan i ul fat, 1903.
11. The Merchant of Venice by Mahdi Hasan Khan - Dildarosh, 1907.
12. Romeo & Juliet by Muhammad Shah. Bazm i fani, 1900.
13. Romeo & Juliet by Mahdi Hasan Khan, Gulnar Faroz, 1902.
14. Romeo & Juliet by Nazer Beg, Firozliga O Gulnarsiyar, 1905.
15. Romeo & Juliet by J.L. Sethi, Gulsaz i Firoz, 1908.
16. The Winter's Tale by Muhammad Shah, Murid i Shakk, 1900.

HINDUSTANI TRANSLATIONS.

1. The Comedy of Errors - By Firoz Shah Khan, Bhul-Bhulaiyan, 1896.
2. The Comedy of Errors - By Lala Sitarama, Bhul-Bhulaiyan, 1905.
3. Hamlet - By Umaro Ali. Jahangir, 1895.
4. King Lear by Lala Sitarama, 1893.
5. Love's Labour Lost by Muhammad Sulaiman, Yaron Ki Mihat barbad, 1899.
6. The Merchant of Venice, Anonymous, Chand shah i sud-khwar, 1895.
7. The Merchant of Venice - By 'Ashiq Husain, Venice Ka Saudagar, 1898.
8. Much ado about Nothing, By Lala Sitaram, Dam i Muhabbat, 1907
9. Othello. By Ahmad Husain Khan, Ja'far, 1895.
10. Othello - By Gopal Goll, 1911.
11. The Tempest (a part only) - By Muhammad Shafi'al-Din Khan, Ferdinand o Miranda, 1896.
12. Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare. By Tejram of Lahore. Part I only, 1899.
13. Lamb's Tales - By Jatindra Nath Sen, 1910.

MARHATHI ADAPTATIONS.

1. All's well that Ends well. By Vasudeva Sadasiva Patavardhanu, Sangit Priyadarshana Nataka, 1912.
2. Antony and Cleopatra. By Ananta Varmana Barve, Srngara manjari, 1906.
3. The Comedy of Errors. By Ramchandra Vinayaka Oka, Mhatarya vyaparyachi goshta, 1875.
4. Cymbeline. By Vishnu Moresvara Mahajani, Tara Nataka, 1879.
5. Julius Caesar. By Kasinath Govinda Nute, Vijaya sinha, 1872.
6. King Lear. By Sankara Moro Ranade, Atipidacharita Nataka, 1889.
7. King Richard III. By Bhaskara Ramachandra Naul, Jayaji Rava Nataka, 1891.
8. Measure for Measure. Anonymous, Samanassana, 1910.
9. The Merchant of Venice - By Atmarama Vinayaka Patkar, Strinaya-chaturya, 1871.
10. The Merchant of Venice. By D.G. Limaye, Mohanechi Angathi, 1902
11. The Merry Wives of Windsor. By Panduranga Gangadhar Limaye. Chaturgadchya Vinodistriya, 1905.
12. A Midsummer Night's Dream. By Ananta Narayana Ukidve. Prema Nakaranda Nataka, 1904.
13. Othello. By Govinda Balala Deval. Jhunjara Rava, 1890
14. Romeo & Juliet. By Kesava Vinayaka Karmakar. Salini Nataka, 1901
15. Romeo & Juliet. By Dattatraya Anantakeskar, Tara Vilasa Nataka, 1908.
16. The Taming of the Shrew. By Vasudeva Balakrishna Kelkar Tratika Nataka, 1892.
17. The Twelfth Night (Konkani dialect) By F.X. Douglas, 1911.
18. The Two gentlemen of Verona (From Lamb's Tales). By Vinayakarava Govinda Limaye, Striyanche Netrakataksha, 1886.
19. The Winter's Tale. By Gajanan Chintaman Deva. Sansaya - sambhrama, 1895.
20. Sangit Sita Nataka (A Midsummer Night's Dream) 1889.
21. Sangit Premagumpha (As you Like it).

MARATHI TRANSLATIONS.

1. The Comedy of Errors. Anonymous. Bhramtikrita chazatkara, 1878.
2. Julius Caesar. By Khanderava Bhikaji Belsare, 1912.

3. King Henry VIII - By Hanasanta Sapurava Atre. Raja Raghunatha Rava, 1904.
4. The Merchant of Venice. By Khanderava Bhikaji Belsare, Venice Nagarcha Vyapari, 1910.
5. Othello. By Mahadeva Govinda Sastri, 1867.
6. Romeo & Juliet. By Khanderava Bhikaji Belsare, Premacha Kalasa, 1908.
7. The Taming of the Shrew (From Lamb's Tales). By Sakharana Parasurama Pandita - Sarasavva Ser, 1867.
8. The Tempest. By Nilkantha Janardana Kirtane, 1875.

PUNJABI TRANSLATIONS.

1. Othello. By Jivan Singha, 1911.

SINDHI ADAPTATION.

1. Merchant of Venice. By Qalij Beg Faridun Beg, Husna an Dilwar, 1897.

TELEGU ADAPTATIONS.

1. All's Well that Ends Well - (an adaptation in 7 acts of the story of All's Well that Ends Well from the Telugu translation of Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare by Rao Bahadur K. Veerasa Lingam Pantulugara). Saundarya Satimani. By Bhava - Narayanudu, 1904.
2. 'Pericles Drama' of Shakespeare - an adaptation. Raghudeva Rajeeyam. By Bhava-Narayanudu, 1899.
3. Cymbeline - Susana-Vijayam. By Hanasanta Rau, 1898.
4. Othello. Jayathradha Nataka. By Padmanabha Razu, 1894.
5. The Tempest. Malati Vasantam. By T.V. Venkatachalamu, 1899.
6. As you Like it. Sree Sarojini. By T.V. Venkatachalamu, 1910.
7. Cymbeline - prose story by P.S. Venkata Rama sinha Rau Nayadu, 1898.
8. King Lear - prose story by Rao Bahadur K. Viressa-Lingam, Chitraketu Charitram, 1910. "

TELEGU TRANSLATIONS.

1. King Lear. By Parana-hansa Vidyananda Svami, 1907.
2. Macbeth. By C.S.R. Krishnaswami, 1895.
3. The Merchant of Venice by Tallapragada Suryanarayana Rao Vanicpura varta Kodantham, 1906.
4. Othello. By C. Srinivasa Rau. Pulinda Susilam, 1909.
5. The Tempest. By Parankhansa vidyananda Svami, 1907.

TAMIL ADAPTATIONS.

1. Hamlet. Amaladitya by P. Sambandam, 1911.
2. Othello. Yudhalolan by P.S. Duraiswami Iyengar, 1911.
3. Romeo & Juliet. By S.V. Srinivasar. Manyanun Solidaiyum, 1908.
4. The Taming of the Shrew - By Kandusami Pillai - Vigata sundari, 1906.
5. Measure for Measure (prose story). By S.M. Natesa Sastri, 1893.
6. The Twelfth Night (a prose abstract). By S.M. Natesa Sastri, 1892.
7. The two Gentlemen of Verona - Suguna-Sukesar, or Friendship and Love. By S. Rama-sami Aiyangar, 1899
8. Cymbeline. By T.R. Sarasalochana Chetti- Sara-sangi, 1897.

TAMIL TRANSLATIONS.

1. The Comedy of Errors. Vibhrana-vihassam. By A. Venkatacharyar, 1905-1906.
2. The Merchant of Venice (venis-varttakan). By S. V. Kallpiram Pillai, 1904.
3. A Midsummer Night's Dream. By S. Narayana Swami Ayar, 1902 .
4. Othello. In the Series, Shakes. For Tamil Homes, 1902.

CANARESE ADAPTATIONS.

1. The Two Gentlemen of Verona. Prose adaptation/ - Kusumakara. By M.R. Annaji Rau, 1897.
2. Tales from Shakespeare by Charles and Mary Lamb. By V.L. Narasimha Sastri, 1909.
3. The Tempest from Lamb's Tales. "Karnataka Granthamala" Series. 1893.
4. Cymbeline. Jaya Simha Raja Charitram. By C.M. Nanjappa, 1907.
5. The Taming of the Shrew. Shakespeare's Story translated from a Telegu story. By B. Soma-nath-Ayya. Gayyali-yannu Badhu-maduvike, 1897.
6. All's Well that Ends Well. Satimani-Vijaya. Translated from Telegu. By B. Soma-nath Ayya, 1897.
7. Cymbeline. In narrative prose. By M.S. Puttanna and K. Bh. Srinivasa Aiyangar, 1881.
8. Macbeth. Pratapa-Rudra-Deva. By M.L. Sri-Kanthess Ganda, 1895.
9. Romeo & Juliet. A novel. By Venkatesa Bhimarau.

CANARESE TRANSLATIONS.

1. King Lear. Hemchandra Raja Vilasa. By M.S. Puttanna, 1899.
2. The Merchant of Venice. Panchala-parinayam. By A. Anandaran, 1890.
3. Othello. By Basappa Sastri and Late C. Subba Rao. Surasena Charitre, 1895.
4. Romeo and Juliet. By Ananda Rav. Ramavarma-Lilavathi-Charitre, 1889.

226
16



APPENDIX II.

Analytical table of Shakespearian Versions in Indian

Languages.

Names of plays.	Bengali	Gujrati	Hindi	Hindustani	Marathi	Telugu	Tamil	Canarese	Punjabi	Sindhi	Total No. of	
											versions	languages.
1. The Tempest	2			2	1	2					7	4
2. The Two Gentlemen of Verona							1	1			2	2
3. The Merry Wives of Windsor		1			1						1	1
4. Measure for Measure	1	1	1	4	2		1				3	3
5. The Comedy of Errors	1										10	6
6. Much Ado About Nothing				1							1	1
7. Love's Labour Lost				1							1	1
8. A Midsummer Night's Dream	1			1	2						4	3
9. The Merchant of Venice	4	1	2	3	1	1	1		1		17	9
10. As You Like It	1		1	1							5	5
11. The Taming of the Shrew											2	2
12. All's Well that Ends Well		1			1			1			3	3
13. Twelfth Night					1		1				2	2
14. The Winter's Tale	2			1		1					4	3
15. King Richard III					1						2	2
16. King Henry VIII				4	3						1	1
17. Romeo and Juliet	3	1	1		2		1	2			15	7
18. Julius Caesar	1					1					3	2
19. Macbeth	2			4			1	1			4	3
20. Hamlet	4			2	1	2					9	3
21. King Lear	1		1	2	1		2	1			8	6
22. Othello	3	1	1		1				1		15	9
23. Antony and Cleopatra	1			1		2	1				1	1
24. Cymbeline						1		2			3	6
25. Pericles						1					1	1